THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

FOURTH SERIES—VOL. III.—(XXXIII).—OCTOBER, 1905.—NO. 4.

CHURCH EXTENSION PLANS.

II.

THE reception accorded my first paper on Church Extension is largely responsible for the appearance of the second. It would be impossible to ignore the fact that the plans have been looked for, and since no merit of author or style could have caused the interest, I am forced to the conclusion that the *idea* of the Church Extension movement has been favorably received and that it now may be considered as to detail. Could I come to any other conclusion after reading such letters as these? An Archbishop in the largest as well as one of the poorest dioceses in the country writes: "I do not think there is a more needed and fruitful movement for the future of the Church in this country and in special in the West and the South. More than once, when addressing the congregations of the Catholic churches of Chicago in behalf of my poor people, I pointed out the fact that, while Protestant money was being lavishly spent in New Mexico in attempts to pervert the faith of our Mexicans, we had to bow our heads in confusion at the query: 'Why don't the wealthy Catholics of the United States do the same as Protestants. Are they less generous, or more indifferent to our pitiful condition?' . . . I expect to continue my collections from September to November. It is pretty hard work for a man of my age and infirmities, but we must get some material support from the outside or shut down." A Southern Bishop writes: "I would be pleased to see your ideas

take practical shape by the formation of a Society. The condition of the Church in many counties of this diocese seems almost hopeless, but if aid could be had from without to build modest churches where there are a few Catholics, we would not only retain our own people but attract many others to the fold. God speed your efforts. If I can help the movement in any way I would be glad to do so." A Bishop from one of the Central States who has been a consistent friend of every good work inaugurated in the Church, writes of results already gained by himself toward a Church Extension movement in his own diocese. He adds: "Facts speak, my friend; *ergo*, go ahead and God bless you." The Archbishop of a Northern diocese who has been most prominent since his consecration in national Church work sends his cordial approval of the movement and an offer to personally and materially aid it. A Western Bishop writes: "I am glad you began the agitation of a subject that has been for years in my mind, and I will follow it up. Your article has started inquiry already and that is something gained. Our plethoric East will have to be stirred up, and I know several priests who are heart and soul in sympathy with our efforts for the extension of the Church on lines similar to the Protestant Churches." Were I to give quotations from the letters received from the priests themselves, I should be obliged to fill my second paper entirely with extracts. Then the Catholic Press gave us a hopeful reception. Especially do I desire to mention the *Fortnightly Review*, which, in an editorial, pledged its future support to the movement. The *Western Watchman* reproduced the first paper as a leader. The *Catholic Citizen* and *Southern Messenger* as well as many of the German papers had long and commendatory extracts, while *Men and Women* gave an editorial endorsement. But perhaps one of the most gratifying letters which reached me came from the Catholic Truth Society of Chicago through its director, the Rev. T. E. Sherman, S.J., asking permission to help by republishing the paper for circulation amongst the laity.

However, I cannot ignore other and less favorable criticisms. I would not willingly ignore them even if I could. I expected, and would have felt somewhat lonesome had I not received them. In the glow of composition it appeared as if I censured other

good works for the sake of Church Extension. My remarks on precious chalices, grand memorials, and collections for foreign cathedrals were, in a very few cases, misunderstood. I can readily see why the misunderstanding took place, though I tried as much as possible to avoid it. I have only this to say in reply. I have been and am now writing mostly for the clergy,—in other words, for men of intelligence and of not a little broad culture. I take very much for granted as to my readers, particularly their unselfish interest in the welfare of the Church in America. I condemned no good work, but rather pointed out the opportunities of a better. Were the directors in a great corporation to learn where the earnings could be enlarged and the usefulness increased, they would be glad to receive and act on the information. It might be different with the clerks in the offices of the corporation. They might measure the suggestion only by the amount of extra labor placed on them or on the loss of their leisure and comfort. There is a world of difference at the viewpoint. Now I am writing for the directors rather than the clerks; surely that is what we members of the clergy are. We dare not ignore one detail of the vast spiritual interests confided to the Church in America. More than one thoughtful man holds firmly to the opinion that the sceptre of spiritual distinction is passing with the course of empire from the Eastern to the Western world,—that here we are building the great fortress for the Church of the future. The fact that our field is great but makes our opportunities the larger. The temptation always has been, and still is, to believe that our obligations end at the lines of our own parishes. They end there only if our love for the Church ends at the same place. They end there only if our patriotism is as local as our religion. City and country, East and West, North and South, are so mutually dependent on one another here in our great republic that no particular part of our work can, in the end, be successful unless we consider the great whole.

A news-letter from Dr. Scharf, of Washington, D.C., was syndicated through the Catholic press from the Catholic News Agency. While I was obliged to look upon it in the light of an adverse criticism, it is somewhat unjust in me to do so, for the article was couched in most friendly terms, and simply pointed

out another phase of Church Extension which the Doctor believed to be far more necessary, in the South at least, than the financial work I advocated. "There are many other features," he said, "that have retarded the progress of the Church in that section of the country. In my humble opinion the greatest needs of the Church in the South are the dissemination of Catholic literature and missionaries." I pointed out in my reply published in the *Fortnightly* that we have already a movement established to do this work of teaching in the Catholic Missionary Union. To establish another Society on the same lines would be most unwise. On the other hand, it would be folly, because the work of the dissemination of Catholic literature is good, to cease all efforts for a work so necessary as this. The idea of the present agitation for a Church Extension movement is to aid financially the building up of the Church in the needy places, "to come to the relief of the hard-working pastor who has scarcely a place whereon to lay his head, much less a spot whereon to rear a decent altar. *It seeks to make parishes.* Who would dare to assert that any book or any missionary could accomplish as much for Christ's Kingdom as could the simplest little church wherein the Holy Sacrifice is offered, the Bread of Life broken, and the Word of Truth spoken?" I am obliged to consider Dr. Scharf's article a discouragement, because it draws attention away from a main idea which we cannot afford to forget for an instant.

The plans which I now offer have but little in them that is original, since they are mostly adaptations from the methods of Church Extension and Building Societies already in existence. What is original may not be wise, and what is not original may not be suited. I offer them only that they may be studied and discussed. From such study and discussion alone can come the needed results. No amount of criticism therefore can hurt or pain me. It is only criticism in plenty that assures us a safe foundation. Besides, if the idea cannot stand criticism now, it will be poorly equipped indeed to stand antagonism later on. While I am convinced that, once started, the Church Extension movement will be the most popular of our charities, yet popularty does not insure against opposition.

Organization.

Every Church Extension movement founded by the non-Catholic religious bodies seems to have, in the beginning, relied upon the society idea. In the case of the Protestant Episcopal Church, a board or commission instead of a society was established, but no money was voted to it by the General Conference. The new work was at once thrown on its own resources and powers with a simple recommendation to mercy and a collection. The board was then really constituted an independent organization. The Methodists have, of late, amalgamated their mission societies and have taken all under conference control, as also have some others; but only after the pioneer work had been done. The idea of a society, officered and controlled so that the interest of clergy and laity might be aroused together, seems to have been the idea that brought forth the pioneer results. So my first suggestion then is that we organize and place the movement in the hands of a Catholic Church Extension Society, to be identified with the Church no more than is the Society for the Propagation of the Faith; self-governing, self-controlled, under officers of its own appointment, but loyal to its work as an auxiliary of the Church and ever ready to conform in all things to the lawful authority of the Hierarchy. The work of such a society established for a definite purpose is less in danger of being side-tracked later on by the seemingly greater interests of the hour.

Object.

Such a society should have for its remote object the cultivation of the missionary spirit, without which the Church can promise itself but little growth. Since the missionary duty divides itself into two distinct but none the less imperative obligations, viz., the care of the weak ones of the household and the spreading of the truth in distant lands, this remote object touches both the home and foreign missions. One should help the other. At no time should there be any clash between them. At present the foreign field is cared for by the Society for the Propagation of the Faith. No organized effort is being made to assist the home missions in a financial way. Of course the proximate object of the society should be the material upbuilding of the Church in necessitous

places of our own country. Now when I say that the foreign field is cared for by the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, I do not mean that we are doing our entire duty toward it, but only that an organized effort is being made to do it. It would in no way interfere with the usefulness of a Church Extension Society as proposed, if its work and that of the S. P. F. should be amalgamated. A united front might then be presented. A number of publications might be established and a general magazine put into circulation. No division need be made in the matter of collectors and officers. At the close of the year the amount of money received could be divided, in such proportions as the Archbishops might decide, between the home and the foreign field. But the work should be done by the Church Extension Society in America. As matters now stand in the neglected home field it seems to me that no less than seventy-five per cent. of the total amount ought to be expended at home. As this home field, however, year after year becomes better able to care for itself, the amount allowed the foreign field might be increased. The S. P. F., were such an arrangement arrived at, should receive in one lump sum annually its allotment and have the distributing of it in the foreign field without reference to the society in the United States; but in consideration of this it should unite its workers in the greater society. This is the only plan I can see whereby we could concentrate our financial efforts.

Membership.

The membership of the society should be divided into three classes. First, Life Members, or those who contribute at one time not less than $1,000 to the Permanent Fund, with the understanding that when the sum thus contributed is not less than $5,000, the contributor shall be further known as a Founder, and shall be a life advisory member of the Board of Trustees. Second, Honorary Life Members, or those who at one time contribute to the Permanent Fund a sum not less than $50. Such members should have a vote at the annual meetings as long as they remain annual contributors to the society. Third, Annual Members, or such as are appointed to represent contributing churches or societies by the society itself or by the pastor, on the basis of one member for each $50 so contributed.

GOVERNMENT.

The only honorary office in the society should be that of Patron, who may have such advisory and veto powers as wisdom may require. He should be appointed by the Archbishops from the Hierarchy to represent them, and to guard the Catholicity of the movement.

The active head of the society should be a President, which office should never be considered merely honorary. On the shoulders of this officer should be placed the burdens of the work. He should be a General Director to carry out the plan of action and should therefore have the selection of his own personal staff, including all the secretaries. He should be elected by the society for a term of not less than five years, since thorough organization could not be done in less time. Under his direction should work a corps of Diocesan Directors and Field Secretaries. Diocesan Directors should be selected only after conference with the Ordinary of each diocese, and every effort should be made to have this a position of trust and honor. The Director should have full charge of the work in his district. In most dioceses in the United States the work would take up all his time, and it should therefore have a suitable salary. Later on more will be said of this official.

There should be two or more Field Secretaries or travelling representatives, speaking and lecturing in the interests of the work They may be sent to the aid of Diocesan Directors when occasion requires. They should be ready to deliver charity sermons and lectures. They should visit wealthy Catholics when the Diocesan Director thinks there is an opportunity to enlist sympathy. It would be their duty to organize dioceses and, in conjunction with the Directors, also Branches and Sunday-School Leagues. As much as possible these men should be good speakers and entertaining lecturers. The reason for this last accomplishment will also appear later on.

The Treasurer and Auditors of the society should be elected at the annual meetings and should be subject, not to the President, but to the Board of Trustees.

The Vice-Presidents, of whom there should be twelve, consisting of four bishops, four priests, and four laymen, selected by

the society to represent the different sections of the country, with the President, should form the Board of Trustees. They may, however, for the greater convenience of government and supervision, delegate their powers to a smaller body, called the Executive Board, selected from amongst themselves. The Board of Trustees, or their Executive Board, should alone have the power to pass on loans and gifts, to make investments and supervise the work of the general office even to the extent of removing any officer from his position for cause and filling his place until the next annual meeting of the society.

Plan of Campaign and Funds.

The Protestant Episcopal Commission was set the task of collecting one million dollars as a Permanent Fund, the interest alone of which might be used in church building operations. Their fund now reaches almost $400,000 after ten years of effort. We must expect better than this; yet it is well to notice that they have aided hundreds of poor churches with gifts and hundreds with loans while the Fund was growing, and that they are assured of perpetuity. Some other sects do not rely upon a Permanent Fund. They too give much money annually, but they must keep constantly at work to secure it. In years to come, other efforts may demand attention. Time brings changes, and the changes bring new demands, the importance of which often relegates the old to the rear. For this reason I believe the Permanent Fund idea to be better, for, although slow in growing, it insures for the future. It is better too because such a fund does a double work. When invested only in church property at a reasonable rate of interest it aids while it grows. Allowing one half of one per cent. for expenses, the money invested at three and a half per cent. would net three per cent. to the society, while always a great aid to hundreds of parishes now paying higher rates. I therefore suggest a Permanent Fund with the marker set at $1,000,000. It may take twenty years to get it, but, since in numbers we are many times stronger than the Episcopalians, we surely ought to take no more than one quarter the time it will take them. From this Permanent Fund the society makes its loans, which should be to such churches only as are able to care for their debts. Not a cent should be lent where pay-

ment of interest or principal is for an instant in doubt. The personal note of the Ordinary should back up every mortgage. The society should imitate others by insisting that the fund is a trust and that the obligations placed upon its guardians oblige them to be most strict in management. Not one cent of this Fund need be lost. Hundreds of good parishes would be glad to avail themselves of the aid given by money at such a low rate of interest. The surer you make the loans the more certain are the gifts.

The earnings of this Permanent Fund should be the basis of a second, called the Gift Fund. As its name implies, it is to be given away. It should not depend alone upon the interest of the Permanent Fund, but should have other sources of income, —such as the Sunday-school collections which, properly worked up, ought to be its very strongest support. From this Fund should be allotted gifts to aid in the building of a new church in a pioneer or a necessitous place. The amount of the gift should be from $50 to $500; no more, except by vote of the society at an annual meeting. Money should not be given to pay off debts on old parishes, since the very idea of this society is to *extend*, to enter new fields. Money should not be given a church costing over $10,000; nor to embellish a building already having what is necessary; nor at all except as a last payment on a new building less the amount allowed by the Ordinary as the parish debt. Money should not be given to build a school, since that presupposes a populous parish able to care for itself, although circumstances should be considered by the society very carefully in this regard; nor to a pastoral residence costing over $2,500. Others, with years of experience behind them, have adopted rules such as these. We cannot afford to ignore the wisdom they have purchased. Of course where gifts to the society have been *designated*, no such rules can be enforced, since the society has only to carry out the wishes of the givers. Exceptional cases could be considered by the Board of Trustees and recommendations made to the society in annual meeting, but neither the Trustees nor the President should have the right to do anything but carry out the provisions of the Constitution as adopted.

A third fund should be called the Expense Fund. This is to carry on the work of the society and from it should be paid

salaries, travelling and office expenses, printing, and such like. This Fund should be in the hands of the President himself, who should account for it to the Board of Trustees annually. It should be voted on the estimates of the President and Auditors. A percentage of the annual revenues should be fixed for this Fund. Should the amount appropriated not be used, a smaller amount could be asked for the year following. The Expense Fund should never exceed its portion of the annual revenues. It was this Fund in particular that I had in mind when I suggested that Field Secretaries should be able to deliver lectures. Having for years been in close touch with the vast lecture interests of the country, my observation has led me to believe that a great deal of Church money is wasted which might be turned to some useful work. I have in mind plans by which Field Secretaries could earn considerable money for the society from lecturing, while at the same time they would be brought into very close touch with the interests of the society all over the country. Into this plan I would not care to enter very deeply for the present, as it is a matter that should be explained in detail to those authorized to carry on the Church Extension movement. For the last three years I have had a greater opportunity than ever to study such possibilities as head of a Catholic Lecture Bureau, and as a result I am fully convinced that a corps of such Field Secretaries could be kept busy and could bring in no small return in the way of money to the Expense Fund. To do this it would be necessary only to stop some good wine from running into waste pipes, as now it is doing.

The question as to the collection of funds necessary to carry on the work of the society is after all the most important consideration. Perhaps because of its very importance I have left it the last to be treated, though it was the first to be considered. That I might have proper advice on the subject I have consulted a number of Field Secretaries from the different Church Extension societies of the country. A Baptist clergyman who had been a member of the Board of Directors of the society of his denomination gave me much valuable information, as did also a Methodist clergyman, the Rev. W. M. Van Slyke, who has been for twenty years Field Secretary of a Seaman's Aid Society. I have also

gone carefully again over the plans of five Church Extension organizations. Both of the gentlemen whom I consulted advised following in part the plan of depending principally on annual collections in each parish to fill a Permanent Fund, but differing in the *method* of collecting. The Episcopalians depend for the collection on the simple recommendation of the bishops. To each diocese has been assigned a quota to be made up. Very few have even tried to do it. For obvious reasons we cannot adopt that plan. Recommendations must be followed up closely to bring results. The Baptists set aside two months of each year for their home missions. They distribute collection envelopes in every church during that period. About the last Sunday of the home mission time the minister preaches a stirring sermon on the subject, and the envelopes are gathered up, either by the clergyman himself or by a member of the congregation, taken care of by the local missions committee, and the amount secured sent to the general office. The Universalists rely greatly on their Two-Cents-a-Week method, which was explained in my last paper. It might be interesting to know the ideas of an old collector whom I consulted on the subject. He says: "My experience of nearly twenty years in the field tells me that the plan of having two funds—Permanent and Donation—is correct. With such strength as the Catholic Church possesses there should be no difficulty in securing your Permanent or Loan Fund of a million dollars within five or six years. I would advise great attention to Sunday-schools. My collection agency has been aided very much in this way. You would be surprised at the amount received from such as the Two-Cents-a-Week plan. But your greatest reliance will have to be on your Field Secretaries, or, as you call them, your Diocesan Directors. The Field Secretary is always worth his salary. Our experience shows that he need not cost more than from one-half to one per cent. of what he brings to the society. The lesson that our experience has burned deepest is just this: *Personal solicitation is everything.* Letters, tickets, pamphlets, all are useful, but the man who sees the other man brings about the results." My suggestion, therefore, is that, since nothing can take the place of a special representative on the ground, in other words a Diocesan Director, he should be the main reliance of the society

in collections. The lack of this official and the consequent reliance on too widely scattered Field Secretaries is the one weakness I have noticed in the different Protestant Church Extension societies. A good Diocesan Director is worth his cost, even though it were as high as twenty per cent. of his collections. He will increase the offerings from any diocese more than one hundred per cent., though the above letter says that to the Seaman's Society he costs but one-half to one per cent. of his earnings. I question if the energetic Director of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith in Boston has an expense account even as great as one half. He has shown conclusively the power of a good Diocesan Director. The greatest effort should be made to secure Diocesan Directors everywhere who give their entire time to the work. It may be objected that bishops, especially in smaller places, would not feel able to give a priest to this field exclusively. I answer that bishops in small places will be the greatest beneficiaries of this society, and therefore will feel like stretching every point to make its work a success. As to the larger places, there is a surplus of priests in some Eastern dioceses now. Once the consent of the bishop is gained in any diocese for the work of the society it is an easy matter to find the Director,—easy because of the surplus in one locality and the interest in another. Where the diocese is very small or the number of parishes few, two or three might be grouped under one Director, who in this case would be called a District Director. The plan too could be followed of changing Directors from one diocese to another when wisdom so dictated and when the bishops so agreed. In some cases strangers to a diocese might do far better work than a local man. A tactful President is really all that is required to keep the work running smoothly and peacefully. It must not be thought that I am over-sanguine in this matter of securing Diocesan Directors. I fully realize the difficulties. I know that it will take years to secure an efficient corps; but once secured they would be the greatest reliance of the extension work. Directors should give their Sundays to preaching in the different parishes and their week-days to personal work. They should take every opportunity of securing other priests who may for a Sunday or two be free from fixed duties, asking these men to visit parishes which

the Director himself could not reach in his annual rounds. One charity sermon is worth a hundred letters. The collection taken up by the Director after his sermon should be credited to the parish as its annual donation and so entitle it to representation at the annual meeting. The Diocesan Director should endeavor to establish Sunday-School Leagues with the Two-Cents-a-Week plan when he visits each parish. He could have a diocesan committee to assist him if necessary. He should be in constant touch with the President and should keep that officer informed as to local conditions calling for special action. He should be free to ask and receive special speakers to aid him in his work. Herein again comes the usefulness of the Field Secretary. No gift or loan should be made without the Director's endorsement as well as that of the Ordinary. He should be the adviser as to real estate values and insurance. All funds from the diocese should pass through his hands and, after records of the same have been made, they should be sent by him direct to the Treasurer, with only a notice of the remittance to the President. He should be the kind of a man whose visits would be a long-looked-for pleasure to the country pastor. He should be full of zeal for the work, eloquent but modest, quick to see and as quick to do. Something of the type necessary is being turned out to-day for business in the great emporiums of trade. There they need the type absolutely. The world of commerce is at such a man's feet. He is the "follow-up-man," the "do-it-now" man, the vigilant. Oh! how we need him, with his energy, good sense, pleasant word, warm smile, hearty laugh, and bubbling enthusiasm, plus a deep grasp on Eternal Truth and the culture that is born at the kiss of the Altar and that grows in the sacred watches of the Sanctuary! "We cannot find him," say you? Yes, we *can* find him! The occasion will make him; and especially in America ought we to be sure of him. It takes only the touch of opportunity and the encouragement of appreciation to bring him at his best.

There will be, however, some dioceses from which the Ordinary cannot detail one of his priests for the work or where for wise reasons he believes that no personal appeals should be made by Directors. I do not mean that any bishop will be found

to forbid the personal work of the pastor or the general appeals of the society, but only where the society's plan for diocesan work for local reasons cannot be followed. For such places I suggest a representative priest in the diocese whose advice would be relied upon in carrying out a postal campaign to be continued until the regular work is made possible. Letters can do much. In such cases, directly from the general office should the letters be addressed to pastors asking them to set aside one Sunday in the year as Church Extension Sunday. In order to make things uniform and to save work at the general office as much as possible the Sunday should be fixed. It should be kept before the pastor's mind by personal letters to him for weeks before the Sunday itself. He should be asked to take up the collection himself, and envelopes and literature should be sent to help him. If only 500 pastors responded to such a call as this in the entire country, it would bring at least $25,000 per annum to the Permanent Fund.

The Two-Cents-a-Week plan is for the Sunday-schools. Branches should be established in these schools and called Sunday-School Leagues of Church Extension. It is wise to remember that it is in the Sunday-school we train our future supporters. The Catechism does not suffice for this training. In a mission country such as ours, where we wisely rely on the generosity of the faithful rather than on the vacillating policy of governments, we ought to train the children to sacrifice a little now, that their interest may be aroused and strengthened for later years. The Two-Cents-a-Week plan does all this. If the society will keep the child informed of the good his mite is doing, it will be the building of a tower of strength for the coming years. The little child who gives two cents a week is, after all, making quite a sacrifice; and the little gift to it appears very great and important. The child, however, feels entitled to some consideration, hence I would have published a Sunday-school paper, or have arrangements made with some Sunday-school paper already published, by which the children would receive a constant reminder of the missions. The publication would be given free to all subscribers to the Two-Cents-a-Week plan. This paper should be full of pictures of missions that have been aided and the churches that have been built. There should be a story too with a touch of the

mission work in it; and then a Sunday-school lesson to make it useful to the teacher. Such a paper would not cost more than ten cents a year to issue. The society would receive for it a dollar. Its cost would be well made up from the fresh interest it inspired every week. The plan of the Universalist Church to accept $26 for a Permanent Membership in the Two-Cents-a-Week plan could very easily be followed. The interest on $26 at 4 per cent. is just two cents a week. Many heads of families would be glad to found such a membership for their children by paying $26 at one time.

Another source of revenue is the income from memberships. This is a work that appeals to the people: "We only ask a chance to reach the people," says a Methodist Director. It is the *home* work, a work for the American Church, a work to save our own,—but a work to be done systematically and with authority. It would save a pastor of large congregations from the unwise appeals for collections which pour in on him from every side. By aiding this work he would feel satisfied that he is aiding all and that the money collected is spent in a systematic effort to help those who are most in need. More than this, the idea of the society's usefulness will grow on him as he sees the work it is doing. Both people and pastor will be interested, and the number of Life and Honorary Life memberships will grow in proportion as the interest grows.

Every Protestant Church Extension society receives each year a great number of legacies. It has been remarked, however, that Catholics have not been so lucky as are their separated brethren in this matter of being remembered in wills. I wonder if it is not because we have had so few organized charities of national prominence. The average Catholic feels that his local church is very well taken care of by local work and that it does not really need the extra money. But he does not always hear of the *general* financial needs of the Church. It is a case of coal and pew rent most of the time. He knows that, year after year, his local church is advancing, and he feels that the people can be relied upon. Although hospitals and institutions in charge of Sisters get more money than we imagine for the support of their work, so many of these institutions nowadays (principally hospitals) are founded

upon such a business basis that our people are loath to give them large sums of money. They cannot see wherein it is needed. Father Doyle stirred up great interest in the Catholic Missionary Union, simply because it is national and necessary and he has told the people about it. He receives both membership fees and legacies. The Society for the Propagation of the Faith in Boston is beginning, I think, to feel the effect of their Director's work in the matter of legacies, yet efforts are confined. The society for Church Extension, having still greater claims upon our charity, surely could rely on a large measure of success. Everything depends upon keeping our wants before our people. Who knows of our poor missions? Who ever tells the people that there is such a need in our own country? The average Eastern Catholic knows all about "the great urgent necessity" for a magnificent church in the city where a saint was born. He gives to that because he does not know of the home needs. Yet only a few weeks ago a priest, a pastor, who wanted to subscribe for a periodical wrote very truthfully: "Our poverty, which has compelled us to find a substitute for tea and coffee in cherry bark and barley, does not allow me to send a single dollar just now." But how could we expect the laity to know these needs when we priests did not know them ourselves. How expect the laity, full of charity for every little devotion, eager for the new vestments, for shrines, for pilgrimages, to know what we priests can scarcely credit when we hear the stories our own Western and Southern missionaries tell us? We can safely trust the people once we have secured the good will of the clergy.

In my first paper I touched upon the matter of annuities which have been of great importance to the work of Protestant societies. There is such an element of risk in the acceptance of annuities that many institutions of charity are unwilling to receive them, since they are usually accompanied by many difficult conditions. Usually the amount to be paid annually is much higher than the ordinary rate of interest. The objections would be fewer in the case of Church Extension societies, for, being in touch with church business interests all over the country, it would not be difficult to place large sums of money in loans paying a better rate of interest than could be expected from our Permanent Fund. In fact a

large number of annuities only tend to make greater safety, since some are constantly lapsing into the society and such lapses protect annuities which are still in force. Annuities therefore should be held in a separate fund and should not be fully transferred to a permanent fund even when they lapse, because of the annual payments attached to them and the difficulties of securing investments to cover such payments. A Church Extension society however could protect itself much better than any other charity.

One of the best suggestions regarding annuities and designated gifts comes from an offer made by a charitable gentleman of Philadelphia to Father Roche of Nebraska, who by the way has long been interested in this work, and who has been doing some of it for years in his own State. The offer was a gift of money to be turned over absolutely free of interest for a term of years to aid in the building of a little church in some mission locality. As the money is paid back, the instalments are placed in the bank and, when the entire amount has been returned, it is once more given to another small congregation free of interest. After five or six years it again reverts to a trustee who, in turn, reinvests it in another needy parish. The mission receiving the money always has before it the thought that another poor parish is waiting on them, so they are stimulated to make a sacrifice and return the money as soon as possible. Such a gift would be constantly at work and would do a great measure of good in perpetuity. Gifts of this kind placed in the keeping of the society, as well as lapsed annuities, would permit loans to the poorest place absolutely free of interest. What an encouragement such a plan as this would give to the charitably disposed! They would know that their money never ceases to do good. How many priests, making wills, would rejoice to leave some of their little savings so that their own priestly work of life would not end even in death, but would go on into the far, far distant future.

It may be noted that nothing has been said of the *support* necessary to sustain some of the weaker places after building work has been done. Many have suggested that it would be advisable to consider this, especially when we are dealing with the poor Mexicans or others unaccustomed to give generously, or unable to do so, but whose souls are just as precious in the sight of God

as those of their more fortunate brethren. Whilst it is true that nothing has been urged in my papers on the question of support, it has not been forgotten. We must crawl before we can walk. We must do first what is necessary before considering a second phase of the work. Let it be remembered, however, that a Permanent Fund of one million dollars for church building is not such a mighty effort, if we are to try at all; much weaker organizations have now almost three million dollars, the income of which is used in both building and support. It is apparent that the future for our own work should be very bright indeed. But if I were to suggest two instead of one million dollars now, it might seem that my expectations had run wild. Yet the doubling of the distance to the goal of our Permanent Fund would work no great hardship on a thoroughly organized and authorized Catholic Church Extension Society in America. Since the building work is the more necessary at present let the first fund be for that purpose. In five years I believe that the society will be in a position to enlarge the scope of its work and to take care of new problems as they arise.

To do all this, however, publicity is absolutely necessary. The financially successful business men are the successful advertisers. A movement of this kind calls for publicity and plenty of it. We must make known our wants. Catholic papers are now very numerous and are usually anxious to do all the good they can. The society should communicate with them concerning the Church Extension movement, asking each for a certain amount of space every month. A fixed advertisement of the society's work could be inserted in this space. It would then depend on the follow-up system of the general office to bring about results. Most Catholic papers would gladly give space for so good a work, especially if the society agreed to furnish such news items each week as would be of interest to readers.

One last word. The writer understands perfectly well that in this attempt at planning he has seemed to ignore obstacles and to take much for granted. This is only partially true. Since the details of the plan have been taken from many societies organized to do, and now successfully doing, Church Extension work, not much more than the arrangement is my own. The obstacles to

the plan itself therefore, in the face of such success, must be few indeed. Almost every obstacle that has presented itself has been to the execution rather than to the plan itself. I acknowledge that it will be no light task, the building up of a Catholic Church Extension society; but we are twelve million and more; we are centred well and strongly; we are not poor; our clergy are well equipped and self-sacrificing; our people are good and charitable; the movement is necessary to our future well-being and our power for the spread of God's Truth; our brethren suffer; and, above all, we have the Eternal Promise, which shall not, nay, which can not, fail. What others have done with less, may we not do with more? No one can seriously deny the *power* to do it. Why not, then, with our history of a century and more of accomplishment behind us, why not take the rest for granted? Church Extension is worth every effort to establish and to follow up, every battle to overcome obstacles,—simply because it is necessary. It may not come from the present agitation, though I believe that it will; but if the burning up of both my papers and the consequent elimination of all my planning follow upon wise and prudent consideration, I will be rejoiced even in securing the jury for condemnation; but still more rejoiced if the ashes of my work may even serve to be mixed with the mortar that holds together the bricks of a real building.

FRANCIS CLEMENT KELLEY.

Lapeer, Michigan.

SYMPTOMS OF DEATH AS A CONDITION FOR ADMINISTERING THE LAST SACRAMENTS.[1]

A Physiologico-Theological Study.

III.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE SACRAMENTS TO ADULTS APPARENTLY DEAD.

POSSIBILITY OF SALVATION.

IT is certain that an adult, whilst still alive and in possession of the requisite dispositions, is capable of receiving some of the Sacraments, no matter how strongly outward appearances may indicate a state of death. It is certain likewise that on receiving

[1] See THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, August, pp. 168 ff., September, pp. 273 ff.

or not receiving these Sacraments will at times depend the salvation of a soul.

To give an example. Let us take an adult who has not received the Sacrament of Baptism, and is found dead to all appearances. Here two suppositions are open: either he has never attained to the use of reason,—in which case it is *certain* that he can validly receive Baptism as a means of salvation; or, he has had the use of reason. In this event he can still *validly* receive the Sacrament, provided he has at least implicitly desired to be baptized, or *now so desires*. But suppose he has committed grave sins, and with these upon his soul has fallen into the state of apparent death, after having at least implicitly desired Baptism, and elicited an act of *attrition*? Under these conditions the administration of this Sacrament supplies the deficiency of perfect sorrow which theologians call contrition as distinguished from attrition or imperfect sorrow. This latter, it should be noted, may actually be elicited by him while in this very state, so as to make his salvation depend upon the reception of Baptism.

In like manner the Sacrament of Penance can be validly received in the case of a Christian adult who has committed grave sins that are not yet otherwise forgiven, and who after an act of sorrow has fallen into this state of apparent death, or else has elicited such an act in this state itself. This is the doctrine commonly admitted in our day. But should he die in this state without the reception of Absolution or Extreme Unction, he is lost; for he has sorrow of attrition only, which would be insufficient to absolve him without the added grace of the Sacrament.

As for the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, every Christian adult in the state of apparent death can validly receive it; and it is certain that if he has attrition, or had it before he fell into such a state, the grave sins he has committed will be forgiven him. All should, no doubt, endeavor to be in the state of grace before receiving this Sacrament of the living. Yet it is universally admitted by theologians that this Sacrament will cancel the grave sins the dying man may have upon his soul, if only he has true *attrition*, being unable to make his confession or an act of perfect *contrition*.[2] And this effect Extreme Unction produces, not *per*

[2] St. Thomas, *Suppl.*, q. 30, a. 1; Suarez, *De Poenit. et extr.*, d. 41, sect. 1, n. 15, etc.; St. Alphonsus, l. 6, n. 731.

accidens, but *per se*, although, according to Suarez and others, only secondarily.[3]

The possibility of conceiving sorrow for sins at the very moment of lapsing into this state of apparent death is evident. Yet it is also possible for one who appears to be quite dead—without pulse-beat, respiration, or other sign of life—to possess interiorly full use of his understanding and therefore in that very condition still to conceive true sorrow for his sins. Cases of this kind, according to Ballerini-Palmieri, are not of such rare occurrence as one might suppose. "Sed non raro videri quidem poterit sensuum plena destitutio, at nihilominus adhuc interior animus vigere."[4]

For this purpose Padre Feijoo in his letter entitled *Contra el Abuso de Acelerar mas que conviene los Entierros*[5] relates two cases described by Monsieur de San Andres, consulting physician of King Louis XIV, in his book entitled *Reflections on the Nature of Medical Remedies and their Effects*, etc.[6]

The witness in the first case was the author's father, also a physician. A man of sixty years of age, exhausted by continuous fever, had fallen into a syncope, and was believed to have breathed his last. Not only were the necessary preparations made for the burial, but there was question, at his son's request, of holding an autopsy. Two curés who were present, fell into a dispute about the right of burial, and the contention soon waxed loud enough to be heard in a neighboring room occupied by the witness. Fearing they might come to blows, he entered to separate them. When peace had been established between the clerics, he approached the apparently dead body, and through a sense of curiosity unveiled the face. He thought he could notice in it a slight twitch, but putting his hand to the pulse, and holding a lighted candle close to the nostrils and mouth, he could find no indication of life. About to turn away, in the belief that the man

[3] Suarez, *l. c.*, n. 16; Pesch, *Praelectiones Dogmati ae*, vol. 7, n. 538.

[4] *Opus Theol. Mor.*, V. 5, n. 861, ed. 3. See also Haine, *Theol. Mor.*, Louvain, 1900, vol. 3, p. 269 (edit. 4).

[5] *Against the Abuse of Unnecessarily Hastening Burials* (ed. Rivadeneyra, p. 577).

[6] Printed at Rouen in the year 1700. An extract is given in Vol. XXXIII of *Noticias de la Republica de las Letras.*

was certainly dead, he thought that he again noticed the same movement. Disturbed at what he saw, he called for some wine, and applied it to the nostrils and poured some into the mouth of the supposed corpse; but with no apparent effect. Once more he was on the point of leaving, when he perceived more distinctive signs of life. There seemed to be an expression of evident relish on the countenance; a little more of the cordial, and the man opened his eyes. The supposed dead man soon recovered and completely regained his health. But what was most astonishing is that *in this state of apparent death he had heard and understood what the two curés had said and after his recovery related it all exactly.*

The second case was told the author by a lady, as her own personal experience. Twenty-four years previously, when still a girl, she had suffered from a wasting fever. While in this state she swooned away and lost all appearance of life, so that her medical attendants left her for dead. Arrangements were being made in her presence, since all regarded her as dead, to wash her body and place it in a shroud, she herself hearing all that was said, without being able to utter a word or give any sign, tortured though she was to indicate to those about that she was still alive. Fortunately for the sick girl, an aunt whom she dearly loved, came to her, and in a passion of grief, with tears and cries embraced and kissed the body, whereat the poor girl was so moved that she burst into a scream. With the assistance of physicians, cupping-glasses were applied to various parts of the body, and by means of this and other remedies she was completely restored to health and lived for many years.

A similar case, which Fr. Peter Marchant relates of himself, may be read in Gury,[7] or Elbel,[8] and examples could be easily multiplied.

IN REASONABLE DOUBT.

As long as there is a reasonable doubt, however slight, whether a man is alive or dead, the Sacraments may and should be administered to him. This is a common doctrine among theologians. All to-day maintain that the Sacraments may and ought to be administered to a man when it is doubtful whether he is

[7] *Casus*, Vol. II, n. 487. [8] *Theol. Mor.*, p. 9, n. 212.

still alive or already dead. Here are the words of Father Gury: "Hinc licet absolvere conditionate in sequentibus casibus: (1) In dubio an poenitens sit vivus vel mortuus . . ."[9] Lehmkuhl teaches the same: "Praecipuae autem conditiones in quibus absolutio conditionata dari potest, aut pro necessitate poenitentis quamdiu non constet de incapacitate."[10] Scavini writes: "Fas est dare absolutionem sub conditione in dubio, an poenitens . . . sit vivus."[11]

This is also what Father Villada means when he says that during the first six minutes that follow what is commonly called the moment of death, it is doubtful whether a man is alive or dead. During this time, he says, the Sacraments may be administered. And since he is of opinion that in cases of sudden death this probability extends much farther, he maintains that during all this period the said administration may take place.[12]

As to Génicot, after noting how difficult it is to say whether a man is actually dead or alive when seemingly respiration, pulse, and the beatings of the heart have just ceased, he concludes that it is better to administer Extreme Unction to those who a short time before have to all appearances ceased to live.[13]

In his *Casus Conscientiae* Génicot adds that in this matter the priest should proceed with great caution, lest the Sacrament be subjected to irreverence by the bystanders, who may be either indifferent or hostile to religion. Under such circumstances it is preferable, he thinks, not to anoint the person, unless a physician declare that it is not yet certain that death has actually taken place. When, however, those present have sincere and earnest piety, it will suffice to preface the conditional administration of the Sacrament by a few words of explanation.[14]

[9] *Comp. Theol. Mor.*, Vol. II, n. 433. [10] *Theol. Mor.*, Vol. II, n. 273.

[11] Scavini Del Vecchio, Vol. II, n. 693.

[12] *Casus*, Vol. III, p. 244, ed. 1. Noldin, *De Sacramentis*, n. 238, note, cites and follows Father Villada. Alberti, *Theologia Pastoralis*, pars I, n. 18, VI, likewise follows him.

[13] "Quare ubi non est timendus contemptus sacramentorum in adstantibus, praestabit inungere eum qui brevi antea expirasse videtur, potissimum si nullus medicus mortuum esse testatus fuerit." *Theol. Mor. Inst.*, Vol. II, n. 422.

[14] "Ubi jam mortuus apparet aegrotus, antequam unctiones dari coeperint, diligenter cavendum est ne sacramentum impiorum irrisioni exponatur. Quare s

How slight a probability as to whether a man has not yet died may be sufficient to enable one to administer the Sacraments to him may be clearly deduced from what authors teach in analogous cases. For theologians commonly hold that in cases of extreme necessity, under which ours must certainly be included, the Sacraments may and should be administered conditionally, even though through apparent lack of one or more of the essential requisites their validity be very doubtful,—and this despite the fact that the Sacrament's validity be only slightly probable or have little foundation or be based on the opinion of others and not on our own.

It is not difficult to demonstrate these assertions by means of clear and authentic texts: "Quoties de existentia conditionis dubitatur, quae ad validam administrationem necessario requiritur, Extrema Unctio non secus atque alia sacramenta sub conditione, quod illa res adsit (si vivis, si baptizatus . . .), administrari potest et debet."[15] "Ubi adsit (in extrema necessitate) tenuis aliqua probabilitas de materia idonea sacramenti hac uti licet."[16]

Marc and Bucceroni write as follows: "Nec obstat quod attritio et confessio in istis destitutis sensibus in actu peccati valde dubiae sint; quia in casu extremae necessitatis, etiam in sacramentorum administratione licet uti probabilitate tenui et parum fundata."[17] "Absolvi potest et debet saltem conditionate quilibet

adstantes parum pii vel ignoti sint sacerdoti, praestabit expectare judicium medici neque inungere eum qui nulla vitae signa praebet antequam ille pronuntiaverit mortem minime certam esse. . . . Aliter dicendum putamus si adstantes pii sunt vel saltem manifeste sinceri et religionem venerantes. Quamdiu enim nullus medicus dubium diremit, praestabit sub conditione sacramentum conferre declarata ratione ob quam ita agatur."—*Casus*, Vol. II, tr. XVI, c. 3, cas. 4.

The Italian translator of the present work here takes issue with Génicot on several points. We give the entire passage:

"We do not entirely agree with Génicot on this point, in spite of our high regard of this author's opinions. He seems to suppose that physicians are apt to pronounce without hesitation in such matters—an assumption that is certainly not well founded. Besides, the fear of dishonoring the Sacraments actuates him too much. We would rather follow the author, who (n. 145) plainly shows how to prevent all irreverence. Lastly, we do not like the word *praestabit*; he should have said at least: *plerumque adest obligatio*, or *per se tenetur*." (Dr. G. B. Geniesse.)

[15] Noldin, *De Sacram.*, n. 444.

[16] Ballerini-Palmieri, Vol. V, n. 238, ed. 3.

[17] Marc, *Inst. Mor.*, Vol. II, n. 1855.

moribundus in quo attritio et confessio praesumi possunt aliquo modo, quamvis infime probabili, quia in casu extremae necessitatis etiam in administratione sacramentorum uti licet opinione etiam parum fundata."[18]

Nor are the words of such authorities as La Croix and St. Alphonsus less decisive. The first teaches: "Est gravis obligatio ex caritate ut sacerdos in extrema necessitate proximi operetur ex opinione probabili saltem aliorum, ut habet communis cum Moya, n. 35; imo opinio etiam tenuiter probabilis practicari debet, si alias proxime periclitaretur salus aeterna proximi, uti tenent multi et graves auctores cum Sanchez, Moya a n. 38, Vind. Gobat n. 27; Viva in append. ad propos. damn. sect. II, quos secutus sum, lib. I, n. 366 . . . nam periculum frustrandi sacramentum pro salute humana institutum est minus malum quam periculum amittendae aeternae salutis hominis: atqui haec opinio [namely that a dying person, *sensibus destitutus*, can be absolved *sub conditione* even though he is not known to have given any signs of penance] est aliquo modo, et saltem tenuiter probabilis, ut ex dictis patet. Ergo."[19]

St. Liguori follows the same doctrine, which may be said to be common to our theologians generally: ". . . quia in casu extremae vel urgentis necessitatis licitum est uti materia dubia ex principio maxime apud theologos probato. . . . Hoc casu enim possumus uti opinione adhuc tenuis probabilitatis, ut recte ajunt Sanchez, de Matrim. l. 2, d. 26, n. 8, et Dec., l. 1, c. 9, n. 25; Viva, dict., Sect. II, V. Ratio; et Croix, n. 1, 162 cum Gobat et fuse probat Cardenas. In prop. damn. Innoc. XI, diss. IV, c. 7, n. 44 cum Navarro, Soto et Filguera. Ratio, quia necessitas efficit, ut licite possit ministrari sacramentum sub conditione in quocumque dubio, per conditionem enim satis reparatur injuria sacramenti, et eodem tempore satis consulitur saluti proximi. Et maxime hic advertendum est quod sacerdos, quando potest, tenetur sub gravi absolvere infirmum, ut dicunt Mazzotta, l. 3, p. 364, et Suar. Vasp. Con. . . . cum communi apud Viva, l. c."[20] Elsewhere St. Alphonsus writes: "In extrema necessitate si

[18] Bucceroni, *Theol. Mor.*, Vol. II, n. 753.

[19] St. Lig., lib. 6, p. 2, n. 1261, No. 7 et 9.

[20] St. Lig., l. 6, tr. 4. *de Poen.*, n. 482.

nequit haberi materia certa, potest et debet adhiberi qualiscumque dubia sub conditione. . . . Et hoc procedit non solum quando est tantum probabilis opinio pro valore sacramenti, sed etiam quando est tenuiter probabilis."[21] Elbel[22] says conclusively: "Colleges etiam illum moribundum esse absolvendum sub conditione, de quo prudenter dubitatur, an adhuc vivat. . . Ratio est quia hoc sacramentum est administrandum in casu necessitatis, quoties affulget aliquantula saltem spes fructus inde percipiendi."

The reason is, as the Instruction of Eichstadt (n. 296) teaches, that in extreme cases recourse must be had to extreme remedies; and it is better to expose the Sacrament to the danger of nullity than man to the danger of eternal damnation. "In hac extrema conditione, prudentius est etiam extrema tentare et sacramentum periculo potius nullitatis quam animam ex defectu sacramenti periculo aeternae damnationis exponere malle."

Nor, in following this course, is irreverence shown to the Sacrament: (1) because the Sacraments have been instituted for man's good and in consequence should be used whenever there is any chance of saving him; (2) because they are administered under condition, and therefore if the condition is not fulfilled there is no Sacrament; (3) if there should be some lack of reverence, it will be excused by the extreme necessity of the dying man. "Nec ideo fiet irreverentia sacramento, nam sacramenta sunt instituta ad salutem hominum; ergo non est contra eorum reverentiam, sed maxime est secundum eorum finem, si prout possunt conferantur, ubi extreme periclitatur salus hominis. Deinde conditio salvat reverentiam sacramenti; si enim moribundus non sit capax, non fit sacramentum. Denique proximi necessitas excusat ab irreverentia, uti constat ex multis similibus casibus in l. 6, p. I, n. 110 et 119 relatis."[23]

It follows from what has been said, that all theologians admit as established principles: *first*, that in case of extreme necessity the Sacraments should be administered even though the probability of their validity be very slight; *secondly*, that in the absence of certainly valid matter, doubtful matter should be used, which principle is applicable to all the other essential requisites.

[21] St. Lig., l. 6, tr. 2, *de Bapt.*, n. 103. [22] L. c., n. 216.
[23] La Croix, l. 6, p. 2, n. 1256 (al. 1156).

"Ergo omnes et Scotistae et alii supponunt duo principia certa: (*a*) In casu extremae necessitatis omnia remedia, etiam tenuiter probabilia, posse et debere tentari; (*b*) Ergo in tali casu licere uti materia dubia ad administranda sacramenta saltem si materia certa haberi nequeat."[24]

Applying this doctrine to the subject before us, we infer that the Sacraments *can* and *should* be administered to men who are *probably* yet alive, although they are commonly thought to be dead; and this even in those cases in which the probability of their being alive may be *doubtful* or *very slight*, and but indifferently founded, or based on the *opinion of others* and not on our own.

Such was the application made by La Croix in these words: "Some physicians assert that the rational soul remains united to the body for a quarter of an hour or more after death is commonly supposed to have set in. If therefore the priest arrives about this time after the person has apparently died, should he absolve such a person at least conditionally?[25]

"I answer affirmatively: if the foregoing opinion, *either by reason or authority*, is rendered doubtfully probable."

The fact that persons who are apparently dead frequently retain the use of hearing proves how expedient it is for the priest, before giving absolution, to prepare them for it by a few well-chosen words.

THE INTERVAL OF LATENT LIFE.

Between the moment ordinarily held to be that of death and the actual moment at which death takes place there is probably in every case a longer or shorter interval of *latent life*, during which the Sacraments may be administered.

Authors generally admit that the Sacraments may and should be administered to those who seem to have just expired, if it be solidly probable, or at least doubtful, that they are still alive,—and this during the entire time that such doubt or probability exists. The only difficulty therefore lies in determining when and up to what point it is probable or doubtful that a man lives after the time ordinarily called "the moment of death."

[24] Pesch, *Praelect. dogmat.*, l. c., n. 85.

[25] L. c., n. 1264 (al. 1164.)

The answer to this question is not the same for all cases; in general we may hold as universally admitted that death does not invade the entire organism suddenly, but only gradually, the separation of soul and body taking place some time after the man is usually said to be dead.

That there exists a longer or shorter period of life between the actual moment of death and that ordinarily supposed to be indicated as such by certain symptoms is generally admitted. Laborde, speaking of this, says: "Between the moment at which the external signs of death supervene, by the suspension of the functions essential to the conservation of life, such as respiration and circulation, and the moment at which the spark of life is totally and finally extinct, there is a period of latent life of greater or less duration, dependent upon the nature of the causes inducing death. During this period the functional properties of the tissues and organic units persist and survive; and these, stimulated into activity by appropriate means, are capable of reviving either momentarily or definitively the functioning of the entire system."[26]

In a communication read at a session of the Academy of Medicine of Paris, January 23, 1900, the same Dr. Laborde said: "At the death or extinction of the vital functions of an organism two successive phases present themselves. During the *first* the chief functions essential to the sustaining of life, respiration and circulation, are suspended; but there still persist in a latent manner, without *external* action or manifestation, the functional properties of the tissues and of the organic elements. During the *second* phase these functional properties are eliminated and disappear, but in a fixed sequence which experiment shows to be the following: the *sensitive* property disappears first, then the *nervous motor* function, and lastly *muscular contractability*."[27]

"It is shown by observation and physiological experiments," says Dr. D. Coutenot of the Medical School of Besançon in the *Études Franciscaines* (January, 1901), "that death does not take place in an instantaneous manner.[28] The organism dies progres-

[26] Laborde: *Les tractions rhythmées de la langue*, p. ii. Paris, 1897.

[27] *Bulletin de l'Académie de Médicine, séance du 4 Janvier, 1900, p. 64.*

[28] This means of course that the manifestations of life do not cease simultaneously; but if by death we understand the final and absolute separation of soul and body, then death is instantaneous.

sively. Death may be brought about diversely, according to circumstances, and according to the peculiar nervous and vital qualities of the individual; but it always takes place progressively."[29]

This conclusion is unanimously affirmed by the Medical Academy of SS. Cosmas and Damian of Barcelona, as we shall see presently. It is also the doctrine of D' Halluin in *La Resurrection du Cœur*,[30] of Capellmann in his *Medicina Pastoralis*,[31] of the theologians already referred to,—Villada, Génicot, Noldin, and Canon Alberti.

The existence of this period of latent life becomes every day more certain, owing to the many cases in which persons have recovered all their vital functions and regained perfect health after manifesting every external sign of death—failure of respiration, of pulse, of heart-beat, etc.—even after experts had been deceived into thinking them dead.

In such cases there is no question of a miraculous resurrection. We have only to realize that animation, although not exteriorly noticeable, still lingered in the more intimate parts of the body, and that the body in consequence was still informed by the rational soul. This latent life reasserts itself and restores the external functions when once the obstacles that impede its activity are removed. If these obstacles are not removed, they finally bring about real death. On this subject consult D' Halluin (p. 87, etc.).

The physiological reason why life still lingers in the more intimate parts of the organism after the cessation of respiration and circulation, is that the cells and tissues that make up the organs have suffered no lesion that prevents their functions. They still possess the means necessary for their vital action, such as oxygen, nutritive substances, etc. And thus, although they must surely perish from inanition unless furnished by respiration and

[29] The same ideas had been expressed by Dr. Coutenot in a communication addressed to Dr. Laborde, as may be seen in Laborde's book, *Les Tractions Rythmées*, p. 167.

[30] Page 96. "We must admit therefore as a conclusion that between the moment when a person has drawn the last breath and the moment when the phenomena of molecular disintegration indicate death, there exists an intermediate state —important to know—a sort of *latent life*."

[31] P. 178 (2d Latin edition).

circulation with new elements for maintaining their life, they will nevertheless continue meanwhile to live at their own expense, as it were, on the organic reserve-fund they have stored up. This state is certain to last until the reserve gives out, or the main vital functions are reëstablished.

It follows that the more healthy and robust and the more supplied with vital nourishment the tissues and inner organs are, the longer will latent life remain in them. This we see in cases of death by asphyxia, by drowning, or the like, in which the organs and tissues are uninjured, and so remain well equipped with the means of life, with an abundant organic reserve. In these cases therefore we find that the condition of apparent death is frequent, and may be of long duration. On the other hand, in cases of severe sickness the whole organism in general and all the organs, tissues, and cells in particular are gradually weakened, and thus consume their organic reserve-fund. Thus, after the stoppage of the principal functions of respiration and circulation in these weakened subjects, life departs much sooner, since the tissues have already consumed their vital nutritive supplies.

We cannot refrain from adding here a few paragraphs taken from the work of Dr. Viader y Payrachs, which clearly show that the opinion we are maintaining had found favor in Spain as early as the eighteenth century.

The absence of pulsation and of respiration, with frigidity of the body added to these signs, was in past ages held to be a certain indication of death. Now, however, experience testifies to the contrary, and a distinction is made between real and apparent death. How a person may remain alive for some time without respiration and pulsation and to all appearances seem a real corpse, is a question we must now attempt to answer. Galenus among others maintains that there remains in the heart an imperceptible quiver, which supports a very feeble respiration and a slight movement in the humors. Other physicians go so far as to affirm that the connection between the circulation of the blood on the one hand, caused by the movement of the heart and the vascular system, and of life on the other, is not so indissoluble that on the cessation of one the other instantly ceases. This statement needs a word of explanation.

The union of soul and body may remain undisturbed, even if the

blood does not actually course through the arteries, provided the conditions are such as to make the restoration of the blood's circulation possible. If, however, not only the blood has ceased to circulate, but all the natural dispositions necessary to renew the circulation, such as the elasticity of the solids and fluids, are destroyed, then all union between soul and body is hopelessly severed.

When all impediments are removed, these dispositions of elasticity, tension, and flexibility of the solid constituents of our body are sufficient to restore the actual circulation of the blood. On this slender thread the union of soul and body is supported. Hence it follows that sentient life, in which the exterior or muscular action is exercised, resides in these dispositions of nature, at least as in a motor force. Hence, too, these dispositions will sustain and preserve the very principle of life, although impediments may thwart its action, until one by one they have fallen into corruption, and thus have been rendered unfit to restore the circulation of the blood. Who fails to see that time is required for a dying person, especially in case of sudden death —as is the general rule with abortives—to arrive at the real terminus of life?

In fever patients nearly the entire human organism is wasted away by the fierce inroads made by the disease. And if in these patients we see that internal motion still continues even after the last gasp for breath and the last throb of the pulse, until indeed the solid mass, because of corruption in the fluids and stagnation in the chief viscera, is destitute of elasticity and power,—may we not suppose that the soul will tarry in the body for a much longer period in case of asphyxia and sudden death? We find no difficulty in conceiving how the heart continues to beat faintly; but besides that it is certain that the entire human body and especially the motor organs of the dying are left intact. The solid mass preserves for a considerable period its own elasticity, to restore if possible the advancing and circular motion of the bodily fluids. These latter themselves remain for some time without the least sign of corruption. The cause of this sudden death may not have been at work for more than three or four hours, and perhaps may have only fettered the animal spirits and held them in suspension.

The practical conclusion to be drawn from the foregoing is that so-called sudden deaths are often mere temporary overshadowings of life or checkings of the vital motions, capable of restoration by those aids which overcome the obstacles. (*L. c.*, pp. 179-187.)

RESOLUTIONS OF THE BARCELONA ACADEMY.

In this connection it will be interesting to quote the two following resolutions of the Barcelona Academy:—

"Resolved 3. Facts have demonstrated that a man can be revived after remaining for hours in a state in which all signs of life have disappeared, such as consciousness, speech, sensibility, muscular movement, respiration and beatings of the heart. This state may logically be called apparent death. (*Approved unanimously.*)

"Resolved 4. The state of apparent death described in the preceding paragraph is more frequent and of longer duration in the case of those who are stricken by sudden death, or by an accident; but it is very probable that a similiar state is brought about for a longer or shorter time in the case of all men, even those who die of a common sickness, whether it be acute or chronic. (*Approved unanimously.*)"

It would appear then that during this period of latent life, by employing appropriate methods for the reëstablishment of the principal functions, all the other functions of life may be made to reappear for a shorter or longer time, and in not a few cases the restoration of the patient to complete or perfect health be attained. To this end various methods are in use, among which a distinguished place must be given to "rhythmic tongue-tractions," introduced by Dr. Laborde. We shall return to this subject later.

The same ideas are expressed by Dr. Coutenot in his article on *Apparent Death and the Last Sacraments.* "In spite of the outward signs, death is nevertheless only apparent. The organism, dead in its outer parts, lives within through the persistence of the functional properties of the tissues, which persistence may be utilized to fully restore life; or else these functional properties disappear, and then death is *real.* The duration of the first phase of death is more or less prolonged according to the causes in operation. Apparent death is therefore a morbid state which demands medical assistance and treatment until a sure sign of real death appears. In presence of death more or less recent we can not therefore know for certain whether or not a trace of life still remains."[32]

P. JUAN FERRERES.

Tortosa, Spain.

[32] *Études Franciscaines*, l. c., p. 44, etc.

THE TRAINING OF SILAS.

VI.—Human Nature Bobs up in a Few Ways.

IT was a long, weary day the eve of that first Friday in November. Father Sinclair had been steadily at work in the confessional since three o'clock. It was now seven, and the stream of the penitents showed no signs of diminishing. Fatigue had almost overtaken the pastor as he stepped out and asked the people near his box to be patient for a short quarter-of-an-hour, while he took his cup of coffee.

Four letters were awaiting him on the table; but he left them unopened. It was near eleven when the last form was seen emerging from the confessional. While the sexton started to put the lights out, the tired pastor walked slowly up the aisle. He knelt down before the main altar and offered the fatigue of the day to the Sacred Heart whose feast he would celebrate on the morrow.

Before retiring for the night he glanced at the letters and opened them one by one.

"*Dear Father:* Couldn't the sexton let me have the candelabra and a few rose-lamps—a couple of dozen—to decorate my flower table? It would look bare without them. And I am positively afraid to ask him."

"*Dear Father Sinclair:* Would you have the kindness to ask the Mayor for the palms from the Civic Nursery, to put in the Hall on the night of the Festival? I sent some one to see him yesterday, but he said he could not give them without consulting the aldermen."

"*Reverend and Dear Father:* Would you let Nanny come to help to wash things on the night of the Library Festival? Several are going to ask for her, but I think I am first."

"*Dear Reverend Father:* Would you have the very great kindness to ask the Brazilian Coffee Company to donate a few pounds of coffee to the Festival for your Library?"

The pastor put the letters on the table, sat down and uttered one long sigh.

"Dear Lord!" he exclaimed, "*Non recuso laborem.* I am willing to work for Thy glory. I am giving sixteen or eighteen

hours a day to show that I mean what I say. But must I now start a-begging for palms and coffee?——One thing is certain, however, —Nanny will stay at home. As for the rose-lamps, they may fight it out with the sexton."

He was too tired to undress even,—he had to carry Holy Communion to seven sick persons in the early morning. After a brief fervent prayer he threw himself on his bed and soon was fast asleep.

The first Friday was radiant. The morning sun sent fresh streams of chastened light through the long, lancet windows, and lighted up the little Gothic church with a softness and grace almost heavenly. The King on His throne, surrounded by flowers and candles, looked down lovingly on the lovers of His Sacred Heart. During the Mass sweet music raised the souls of the worshippers above the earth; and when the hundreds who received Holy Communion lingered after the service to commune longer with our Lord, Father Sinclair felt that his zeal had not been sterile. "I will give to priests who spread this devotion the gift of touching the hardest hearts." There were not so many hard hearts to touch in St. Paul's Parish; the League of the Sacred Heart had done its work; and the tears of consolation and piety that flowed that morning in St. Paul's plainly told the pastor that the Saviour's promise to Margaret Mary had been fulfilled to the letter. And as a consequence, Father Sinclair was happy.

But there was a weight on him nevertheless. How was he to go a-begging for coffee and palms? What were the committees named for? He had on a former occasion put his foot down and told an officious vice-president that soliciting for an entertainment did not come within his scope of duties. The lesson had undoubtedly been forgotten; he should have to repeat it. For the moment he would compromise; he would buy the coffee and send it to the Hall. For this once, also, although his shy nature rebelled against such work, he would call on Wesley Bruce and ask him for the palms that had already been refused. Father Sinclair could plan; he could suggest; he could urge; but he felt an inmost aversion to going a-begging such petty favors.

At ten o'clock he telephoned to the Brazilian Coffee House to

send five pounds of its best coffee to Monument Hall before five o'clock on Wednesday, and charge to his account. He then took his hat and cane and walked down to the post-office.

The pastor of St. Paul's was a welcome figure down town. His spirit of progress, his interest in civic celebrations, his zeal for promoting public works, were well known. It was he who suggested the artistic arches over the Brono bridge; it was he who headed the subscription list for the massive electric columns in Royalview Park; it was mainly he who got the City Band to play twice a week in the Eagle Rotunda; it was through his efforts that Corot's "Twilight" was now in the Art Gallery; it was he who had been working almost alone for two years to have a monument raised to the little hero who lost his life trying to save another in the Brono; in a word, Father Sinclair was the mouthpiece of the "sixth sense" in Laurenboro; for he was essentially artistic and a lover of the beautiful.

But he was preoccupied on his way down town that morning. And still the palms were public property. The new library would be a benefit to the public. It would help to make good citizens. He ran lightly up the steps of the post-office, and was pushing the massive doors inward when he stood face to face with the Mayor.

"Good morning, Father."

"Good morning, Mr. Bruce." He was about to pass on, when he suddenly turned on his heel. "By the way, Mr. Mayor, could we have the Civic Nursery palms for an evening this week? We are getting up a little——"

"Certainly, Father. Come over to my office."

And that was all there was to it. Father Sinclair came away with an order to the civic gardener to let him have the palms "as long as he wanted them"; besides, they were to be delivered at the hall for him.

The agony was over. But he asked himself:

"Is it pride, this shyness, or is it a too delicate sense of honor, that makes my life so miserable?"

He could solemnly aver that it was not pride. He simply could not do such things. Henceforth he would see to it that his people should not ask him.

A call later in the day at the glebe-house from Mrs. Melgrove and the secretary told him that the tickets were going fast; two hundred dollars had already been handed in.

"This is a splendid showing," said the pastor, "and there are still three days."

"But several visits we made, Father, were very discouraging," ventured Mrs. Melgrove.

"And a few snubs into the bargain," added Miss Garvey. "The Newells told us plainly they wanted no new library. They were satisfied with the Elzevir; and they would not contribute a cent."

"And what did you say?" asked the pastor, sympathetically.

"What could we say? We simply turned on our heels and walked away," replied the little lady.

"You did the proper thing there, ladies. A little humiliation, was it not? And within the Octave of the First Friday, too?"

How well Father Sinclair could preach to others. Had he been in their places, and been refused, he would have shrunk into his very humble substance.

"Even though the Newells do not come to the festival," he continued, "they might have taken a few tickets—mightn't they?—to help a good thing along."

"Certainly they might. Miss Rayford called on them," added Miss Garvey, "for a contribution of flowers, and they positively refused her."

"Never mind. We have something better. We have the palms from the City Gardens," said the Father, bravely. "Monument Hall on festival night will look like a corner cut out of Honolulu."

"And we called at Mr. Maglundy's," added the little secretary.

"Pray tell me how you were received there?"

"Very well. He took one ticket. He said he was a chronic bachelor, and should not need more than one. He is very anxious to meet you, Father. He wants your opinion on a fountain he is going to build somewhere in town. He also wants an inscription in Latin or Greek." And the ladies laughed heartily.

"We shall have to accommodate him, then. This may be the

thin edge of the wedge to Mr. Maglundy's heart," retorted the pastor, slowly. An excellent occasion of meeting this stranger had thus presented itself, and Father Sinclair was gratified at the turn events were taking.

"But the pleasantest visit of all was to the Caysons," continued Mrs. Melgrove. "Just fancy! They had already taken twelve tickets for the Festival before we reached there. And when Miss Garvey saw the twelve spread out before her, she had not the courage to ask them——"

"What?" interrupted the pastor, smiling; "to buy more tickets? Isn't there a stronger term than 'courage' required to ask a person to buy more than twelve tickets?"

"No matter, Mrs. Cayson was splendid. She asked us if we had no tickets to sell, and we both burst out laughing. She took four more, and she promised a contribution to each of the tables. Her two daughters, Clare and Mary, are busy since yesterday making candy. And Clare is going to help us to sell."

"God bless them," said Father Sinclair; "isn't it consoling to meet such people in this chilly, selfish world. But let us go back to Maglundy. Did he name any time at which he wanted to see me?"

"He said he would call on you at the glebe-house, or he would be in any day after three. If you will only telephone, he will send his carriage."

"I shall surprise the old gentleman some day before the Festival. I should like to see him there. So would the ladies, wouldn't they?"

"By all means. Try to get him, Father. We shall take care of him, once he reaches the Hall," said Miss Garvey. "But he did not impress me as one who would open his purse, even for a library. He might have taken more than one ticket."

"Seeing that he had money to throw away on living fountains and——" answered Mrs. Melgrove.

"And on dead languages," interjected the pastor.

The two ladies departed, only to admit two more,—Miss Pickwell and a friend.

"I am so glad you got my note, Father. The coffee has arrived. I really could not ask that horrid manager."

Miss Pickwell lived in an elegant mansion on Nob Hill, and Father Sinclair was just thinking that she might have bought the coffee herself. But the lady kept right on.

"Last year he was so ugly about a small affair. Imagine he hinted that I should buy my own donation. And I promised that I should never patronize him again."

"That is why you sent me, wasn't it?" asked the pastor smiling.

"Well, I knew he could not refuse you. And you see he did not. We have just come from Mr. Maglundy's, Father."

"I suppose the millionaire simply bought up all your tickets," ventured Father Sinclair.

"Indeed, no. He told us that he had already been supplied. Some one had got in ahead of us."

"Is he coming to the Festival?" asked the priest.

"We invited him, but I do not think so. Besides, I hardly think we want him."

"What, Mr. Maglundy! a millionaire? Do not want him at the Autumn Festival? What do you mean, Miss Pickwell?" asked the pastor, apparently surprised.

"Oh, I don't know. Wait until you meet him, Father. He wants to see you to do something for a fountain."

"Fountain? He must have money to throw away."

Father Sinclair was fishing for impressions, and the reasons of their aversion soon began to come out.

"But, Father, he is so uneducated," said Miss Pickwell.

"What of that, my child? Want of education is not a sin."

"But he is so conceited and boorish. Always talking about himself and that fountain of his."

"He may have had interesting things to say."

"But they were not interesting, were they, Madge?" asked Miss Pickwell, turning to her companion. "What did he mean by telling us all about his Trans-Siberian stocks, and bulls, and bears, and everything that we know nothing about?"

"Perhaps he is going to start a menagerie. Would you not like to see some trans-Siberian bulls and bears?"

"Father Sinclair, you are perfectly dreadful. When we tell you things, you never listen. All the same, thanks for the coffee. Come on, Madge."

VII.—A Millionaire with a Hobby.

Miss Pickwell would have had some difficulty in proving her assertion that Father Sinclair never listened. He had been listening, and listening attentively to all he heard during the past few days; and, what is more, he had been reflecting on the inconsistency of it all. Could this be Christian charity? Could it be the charity that the Gospel counselled? Here were twenty or thirty members of his flock trudging around the city trying to dispose of tiny squares of cardboard, at so much apiece, which would admit his own parishioners—wealthy, a fair proportion of them—to Monument Hall, to amuse themselves before they would contribute to a crying need.

"Even when they give an alms for a good work," he mused, "they must first get their money's worth."

Was this Catholic charity? Nay more, was it common justice that the flower of his flock should be obliged to go from house to house, or busy themselves at home for days and days, simply to entice people to spend a few dollars in aid of a work they themselves and their children should profit by?

"We'll see," said Father Sinclair, continuing to soliloquize "that the very people who spend the least shall be the ones who will have all the fault to find with the library and its management later on. I know what is coming. Those little ticket-sellers of mine and those little candy-makers are heroines. They do more for charity's sake than the rest of the parish put together. And the snubs and the rebuffs they are getting are simply galling. One would think they were working for their personal profit."

The pastor was walking up and down the balcony of the glebe-house. He had his great coat and cap on, and his gloves. He was about to make a visit to Mr. Maglundy. This new arrival in Laurenboro had been brought to his attention so often lately, and in such an unfavorable light, that he could hardly say he had much confidence in him.

Small things often give us the key to greater ones. That fountain project which he had heard about from different sources suggested a certain sense of civic vanity on the part of Mr. Maglundy; and the inscription in a dead language which he desired seemed

very much like an affectation. These qualities in the stranger did not forbode a favorable understanding between the two men when one of them was in quest of charity from supernatural motives; and Father Sinclair felt a distinct repugnance to call on the millionaire. Would he find out when he learned to know him better, that this was one of those mortals who try to get all the glory they can, at the least possible cost to themselves? Maglundy had wealth, evidently. He had now reached the glory phase. He was going to build a monument to himself in Blenheim Square. We should soon see him in politics. Later would come the phase of pleasure-seeking. To reach heaven such men should have to compete with the camel that would force its way through the eye of a needle.

But all this soliloquizing was verging on uncharitableness. Father Sinclair justified himself by the conclusion that he had been thinking only of abstract cases. He could truly say that he did not know Maglundy. So that all the hard things that had passed through his mind about rich *parvenus* in general did not necessarily apply to him.

Half an hour later the pastor walked up the steps of the great limestone mansion at the corner of Howarth and Buell Street. A gardener was gathering the dead leaves into heaps here and there on the sward. The long, prettily shaped flower-beds, with their wealth of violets and roses, which Father Sinclair had so often admired during the summer months, lay bare and wretched. The sere was on nature, and had a depressing effect on the æsthetic instincts of the visitor.

A maid, a somewhat slatternly dame who had reached the years of discretion, took his card on a very large silver tray, and then with a "this-way-please," uttered in a voice that attempted to be soft, drew the portieres aside and ushered the priest into the drawing-room, a realm of luxurious splendor, and a sort of wonderland in which the beholder was confused by the number and variety of curious objects gathered in from the world without.

Father Sinclair felt a sense of the incongruous. Was it a drawing-room or a museum? His instinct told him, however—had he not already known it—that Mr. Maglundy was a bachelor, and that probably the woman who took his card was to blame.

A rather strange spectacle was presented by the ingenious display of a genuine pick and shovel and a miner's pan, the heraldry of the mining world, resting against the mantelpiece. The owner of the house was evidently proud of these implements. There were cabinets along the walls filled with gimcracks of every description and California curios. A few books on mineralogy lay covered with dust on the centre table. From the ceiling hung a huge Japanese umbrella, on which the dust had gathered notably, a relic no less of shiftless management than of a sojourn in the West. There were other signs of neglected wonders which by their peculiar position indicated that Maglundy was at the mercy of a housekeeper who had not the same respect for them as must have animated the original lord of these things. The priest sympathized with him, and was just instituting a comparison between the guardian spirit of this household and his own good-natured but not very tidy Nanny, when a quick, jerky step was heard coming down the stair. The portieres were drawn aside and revealed Silas Maglundy himself, a smiling little lump of a man, not more than five feet high, corpulent, with bald head and ruddy face, sympathetic blue eyes, prominent nose, and a tuft of whisker under each ear.

"How do you do, Fawther?" he lisped.—We may here tell the reader in confidence that Mr. Maglundy's grammar was above reproach, but all his a's were aw's, and all his minnows, whales, as the pastor soon discovered.—"I am delighted to meet you Have indeed been anxious to meet your reverence for some time."

He pressed the visitor's hand with a grasp that seemed to betoken genuine cordiality. Pointing to a chair, and falling into one himself, he proceeded:

"I am a Cawtholic, you know."

"I had heard so," replied Father Sinclair, demurely, "and I am very well pleased to meet you; indeed I had hoped to have that pleasure before this."

"My fault, sir, that you did not; although I have been in Laurenboro little over a month. Quite a beautiful place this city of yours. Was quite a revelation to me. Think I shall reside here permanently in future. I hope in fact to do something in my own small way to improve conditions here."

"The fountain will soon be out," thought Father Sinclair, and he felt a budding impulse of merriment upon the consideration of this little vanity. But he concealed his sentiments. The first glimpse the old man had given the priest of himself was that of Maglundy smiling. The impression was favorable and was destined to remain with him.

"Your name is Saint Clair, Fawther. I used to know a family out in California of that name—the Saint Clairs, well-to-do——"

"They may be distant relatives of mine," replied the pastor in a somewhat facetious tone. "Ours was a large family. We are descended from Noah Primus, a navigator. He sailed in his own vessel, but got stranded on a mountain."

"How sad," exclaimed Maglundy, sympathetically. "What a calamity! Accidents will happen. Was everything lost?"

"No; the family was saved; and the live-stock."

"I am so glad to hear that. How consoling!"

"So you are going to stay with us, Mr. Maglundy?" asked the pastor, endeavoring to turn the subject.

"I think so, Fawther. My interests are centered in Laurenboro for some time to come. You know I have been engaged in mining for some years in California, and had a half-ownership in a quartz claim out there. Do you smoke, Fawther?"

"Occasionally."

"Well, just come upstairs. I want to talk with you. And besides, I want to let you into a little secret of mine, and get your advice."

"The fountain, to a certainty," thought the pastor, as he followed the little stout man upstairs.

The smoking-room was a cosy spot. A few delightfully fashioned easy chairs invited occupation. Photos of California mining-camps almost covered the four walls.

After they had lighted, Maglundy continued:

"Yes, I had a half interest in a claim out there. One day I struck a pocket—or 'blow-out'—as we miners call it, and I saw what I had. I bought the other half interest and developed the mine myself, which proved a tremendous payer. Naturally I drifted from mines to stocks, and manipulated successfully in

Trans-Siberian. And here I am, as you see, a success in life,—made my pile, as my old friends the miners say."

And Maglundy settled down into his leathern chair with evident satisfaction.

"What became of your partner?" asked Father Sinclair.

"I don't really know; his future did'nt worry me. Why should it?"

"I really do not know why it should not," rejoined the priest. "You say he was your partner,—and I fancy he must have naturally been interested in your discovery."

"Oh yes, I understand. That was years ago, but I lost sight of him long since. I think he is somewhere in the West still. But that does not worry me. I purpose doing something for my fellow beings. Some one of your learned men has said, I think, that a private good must give way to the public weal."

"Yes, certainly, private weal must cede sometimes to the common benefits provided justice is not involved."

"No doubt you are right; but of course the law takes care of that, and we need not go out of our way to be just where everyone can claim his own in the courts."

The old miner evidently did not care to discuss the subject from the ethical point of view; he was in a philanthropical mood, and no doubt was anxious to broach the favorite subject of the fountain. How true it is that when a man has a hobby he makes the rest of the world suffer. The irrepressible topic is served up on all occasions, and with every kind of sauce. Not, of course, that he wishes to tire his victims, or give them indigestion. It is only because the hobby controls him and he himself has become its victim. Apparently, Maglundy had reached this stage; the pastor's keen mind had divined it clearly enough.

"I want to let you into a little secret of mine. I may as well tell you that I intend to present a drinking-fountain to the citizens of Laurenboro, for the use of man and beast. And I have had the design drawn of what I wanted."

The old man pulled out of a pigeon hole a well-thumbed document which he unfolded and put before the amazed eyes of Father Sinclair. There was a clear-drawn pen-and-ink sketch of a cow lying on a hillock in a pool of water.

"The idea is original, isn't it?"

"It certainly is," exclaimed the priest.

"And I think it will be welcome to the citizens of Laurenboro. You see, I have always had a great love for dumb animals. They are useful to man. But I think their place is not properly estimated in the domain of art. We have tigers and lions and horses to represent the animal in monuments; but no one ever has introduced the cow to express the nobility of useful service. Yet this animal provides us with food and drink and clothing.

"Is there anything on this green earth more attractive than a field of cows, or more grateful and nourishing than a glass of fresh milk? What poet was it who sang

'The lowing cows come walking o'er the fields?'"

"Homer, possibly," quickly answered Father Sinclair, half thinking that the old man might be doting.

"I can almost see those gentle glassy eyes, and hear the swish of the tail. Out in California we once had ——"

But the visitor was getting fidgety. He handed back the roll to the owner, and was preparing to leave.

"The design for the work is almost completed, as you see it there; but I would be pleased if you would make some suggestion, Fawther, as to the construction or details."

Father Sinclair reflected a moment.

"Are you really in earnest about this matter, Mr. Maglundy," said he, with a humorous air. "I should say you want a shed for the cow, of which you seem so fond; it is hardly fair to keep her outside in all kinds of weather. The winter is coming on."

"Why surely I am in earnest, Fawther," said the millionaire; "but of course the cow will be of bronze."

"Why not put a canopy over her,—to keep the rain off?"

"But how could that be done? It would alter the design."

"And besides," continued the pastor, not minding the interruption, "she will be lonesome. Why not add a calf or two?"

"That would materially alter the expense, Fawther; extra piping, and so on," said Maglundy, not seeming to realize the ridiculous element in the criticism of a project which he had

fondly cherished until it had absorbed all his sense of the ludicrous.

"I admit it would cost something more. But then your fountain would serve a double purpose."

"Indeed! How so?" Maglundy's eyes were flashing in wonderment.

"It would be a monument to the donor, and an emblem of motherly affection."

"Affection?" exclaimed the millionaire.

"Why yes. I mean of bovine maternal affection."

Maglundy stared; but it was the stare of vacuity. The old man thought he understood.

"Down goes the calf, Fawther."

And taking pen and paper he wrote: "one or two calves; affection, shelter, extra piping."

"But this must be your own idea, Mr. Maglundy,—not mine. Do you hear?"

Father Sinclair had not expected so complete and ready an acquiescence to his suggestion; and became alarmed lest in his earnestness to carry out the monumental idea Mr. Maglundy might quote him as authority for the alterations in the design.

"O yes, Fawther; I shall take care of that. I am glad I consulted you before I gave out the contract."

The old man folded the document again and carefully laid it away.

"Now, Fawther, I am anxious to have an inscription to put on the fountain. I have passed many an hour thinking what it might be. Anything in English would be too common to put on a bronze tablet,—don't you think so? What would you suggest?"

"I really do not know," replied Father Sinclair. "Do you want one in German, or French, or some other modern language?"

"That is just what I do not want. I have read, and you of course know, that living languages change in course of time, and that dead languages don't. I should like a language on the slab that would not change. It ought always be able to tell who gave the fountain to Laurenboro."

"How would Greek or Latin do?" asked the pastor.

"They are dead languages, not likely to change?"

"Dead as a door-nail," echoed the priest.

"I think I should prefer Greek," ventured the old man.

He handed Father Sinclair a tablet and pen, who wrote, with something of an ironical smile:

ΣΙΛΑΣ ΜΑΓΛΥΝΔΙΟΣ
ΜΕ ΔΕΔΩΚΕ

Maglundy seized the paper and looked at it. It was clear that the old miner's classics had been neglected, for he turned suddenly to his visitor and exclaimed: "What is this, Fawther?"

"The Greek inscription for your fountain."

Maglundy examined it carefully, turned it about in various ways, and said, somewhat dejectedly: "I don't know Greek, Fawther, and wouldn't be able to tell which is top or bottom; but tell me what it means. I am afraid most people would be as much puzzled as myself, and no one could ever tell who gave the fountain to Laurenboro. What is the English for that?"

The pastor pointed out the Greek words, and read, *Silas Maglundy donated me.*

"Of course, it is the cow which is supposed to be speaking," he added, with a little vicious smile; for the outlines of a comedy worthy of Molière began to grow up before him with lightning rapidity.

"The idea is there, Fawther; but I don't think I should like that. The words cannot be read. Why, I cannot make out my own name. How would it be in Latin?"

The priest took the tablet again and wrote:

SILAS MAGLUNDIUS ME DONAVIT.

"This looks more like our own English, doesn't it?. Indeed, I can recognize my own name. But that IUS at the end—what is it there for?"

"It gives the word Maglundy a classical touch."

"Do the other words mean the same as the Greek?"

"The very same thing," answered the pastor.

Maglundy pondered, gazing intently meanwhile at the tablet.

"I do not like that word ME so close to my name. Ignorant people in Laurenboro might suppose the cow was calling herself Maglundy," said the old man laughing.

"I can give you another phrase which renders the same sentiment," suggested the pastor.

"If you please."

Father Sinclair took the tablet a third time and wrote:

DONUM SILAE MAGLUNDII.

"What does this mean?" asked the old man.

"*The Gift of Silas Maglundy.*"

"Those two II's at the end of my name do not look well. Could they not be changed so as to leave the name straight, plain, humble Maglundy which everybody would recognize at sight."

"Not easily, sir. Latin is a dead language. I think you had better stand by the second," said Father Sinclair, pertly. He was tiring of the comedy.

"Very well, Fawther, I shall."

The pastor rose to go.

"Tell me, Mr. Maglundy, do you really mean to have that design carried out, and to set that cow up in Blenheim Square?"

"Undoubtedly I do. Transferring a gentle brute of the fields to Blenheim Square; the idea is poetic, is it not?"

"And decidedly bucolic," answered Father Sinclair, wearily, putting out his hand to him. "I fear I must be off, Mr. Maglundy. We are going to have a Festival in Monument Hall, on Wednesday night, in aid of a Free Library I should wish to establish for our people. I think that you might help us in the good work, seeing that God has given you a large share of this world's wealth. You are laboring at this moment to be useful to our citizens in affording them by the erection of a monument fountain an opportunity for quenching the thirst of their bodies. The ladies of my parish are working hard these days to slake a thirst in souls. A good library is a fountain of living waters and we are without one. Will you come to Monument Hall on Wednesday?"

"I fear I may be engaged with my contractors on that night. However, I shall do my best to get there."

Father Sinclair slipped downstairs, donned his coat and cap, and passed into the street, thankful to be out of the domain of what he considered at that moment the greatest bore of the century.

"We shall not see Maglundy at the Festival, that's certain," he mused, as he turned homewards; "that fountain for the citizens of Laurenboro is simply to be a monument to himself; and the Lord forgive me, but it will be most appropriate."

Only one thing tormented him. If that good-natured but vain old man should dare tell any one that it was the pastor of St. Paul's who suggested the addition of the calf, it would be all over with him. He consoled himself, however, by the reflection: "Most likely Maglundy will take all the glory of the design to himself; and he is welcome to it."

It was almost dark when he reached the glebe-house, tired of his useless errand. The impression left upon him was that his new parishioner, though shrewd enough in certain ways that had helped him to his wealth, was a mixture of ignorance and vanity in equal parts.

> "From ignorance our comfort flows,
> The only wretched are the wise."

Yet that was not all: there was something more in the man which had not escaped the keen sense of Father Sinclair, despite his being irritated at the vulgar eagerness for self-advertisement which he had discovered in him. The sympathetic blue eyes and a certain frankness and simplicity of manner bespoke something nobler in Mr. Maglundy's heart than what appeared on the surface; Father Sinclair felt this, and the time might come when this better element would assert itself in behalf of the cause of religion.

Mrs. Melgrove had been waiting for nearly an hour.

"Three hundred dollars are already in, Father," she said; "but the orchestra which promised its services, now wants to be paid."

"Well, I suppose we shall have to pay for the whistle."

"And a bill has come in for the ice cream which was accepted as a donation the other day at the meeting."

"Let us foot the bill out of the receipts. We shall have that many books the less," added the pastor, resignedly.

"Are not some people queer?" asked the President.

"Some people are queer, Mrs. Melgrove," answered the pastor philosophically.

"However," added the energetic lady, "we must not complain too much. Mrs. Molvey has sent us her large lamp and some chandeliers for the tables; and she has promised to work in the Hall. Miss Gye has promised to sing, and Mr. Trebble will accompany her. And there are ever so many things that I wanted to tell you—Oh, yes; the ladies are anxious to see Mr. Maglundy at the Festival."

"I have just come from his house, and I fear the ladies shall be disappointed. The old gentleman has other things on his mind at present."

"I am so sorry. Miss Garvey was going to take charge of him," said Mrs. Melgrove, laughing. "Do you know, Father, he is a very wealthy man. My husband tells me he owns one of the richest quartz mines in the West, and that he nearly created a panic in Trans-Siberian stocks, on Wall Street, a few months ago. Could you imagine such a thing?"

"I certainly could not," replied the priest. "But let us suppose Mr. Maglundy has developed along financial lines; that will explain the limitations in other directions. At all events, I do not think we shall see him at the Festival. I shall sympathize with him if he reaches there, and Miss Garvey sets eyes on him. What are the prospects for Wednesday?"

"Very good. I do hope to clear five or six hundred. We have some excellent workers in this parish, earnest and zealous. Our little ticket-sellers and candy-makers deserve all praise. They have worked hard during the past fortnight. Their booths are simply fairy dells; and I should be sorry if they were disappointed."

"Did the palms arrive?" asked the pastor.

"The palms are in the Hall, and they give quite an Oriental aspect to the whole scene. However, we shall see you on Wednesday, Father," said Mrs. Melgrove, rising.

Father Sinclair opened the door and added: "Tell Miss

Garvey that if the millionaire does not appear at the Festival, there are the 'inseparables' to take his place,—Gray the Bachelor and his friend Tompkins. They are both wealthy, and they are sure to be there."

E. J. DEVINE, S.J.

Montreal, Canada.

(To be continned.)

THE OTHER VIEW OF SACRIFICE.

THE two articles by the late Bishop Bellord which have appeared in these pages, one entitled "The Notion of Sacrifice,"[1] the other "The Sacrifice of the New Law,"[2] are designed to revolutionize the theology of sacrifice. Hitherto theology has uniformly taught that sacrifice is the offering of a victim by a priest to God, to testify His supreme dominion, and our entire dependence upon Him. Another theory is now proposed for our acceptance. I will state it in the words of the author: "The great bulk of theologians have considered sacrifice to be essentially a destruction of life in honor of God, for the purpose of expressing latreutic worship, or repentance for sin and atonement. This may be termed for present convenience the destruction-theory. It is now alleged on serious grounds that sacrifice is of the nature of a meal, and that its object is to assert a bond of union between the partakers and the Deity. We may call this the banquet-theory." Respect for the office, the character, and the memory of the lamented author of these articles renders the task of reviewing them (one not of my own seeking) a particularly distasteful one, for I cannot conceal from myself that the criticism must be a gravely adverse one.

The first article deals with sacrifice in its generic concept; the second applies the general theory to the death of the Cross and the Sacrifice of the Mass, the conclusion being, first, that the death of our Lord was not of itself a true sacrifice, but only partakes of the nature of sacrifice by its association with the Last Supper, *i. e.*, by being considered as a ceremonial element of the sacrificial ritual the essential sacrificial action of which was performed at the

[1] See REVIEW, July, 1905. [2] *Ibid.*, September, 1905.

Last Supper, this being the only literal sacrifice offered by Jesus Christ; and secondly, that the sacrifice of the Last Supper and in the Mass consists essentially in the distribution of the Blessed Sacrament as food. The remarks therefore that I have to make naturally fall into four divisions, and may conveniently be placed under the following heads: (1) the banquet-theory of sacrifice in general; (2) the Sacrifice of the Cross; (3) the Sacrifice of the Mass; (4) the relations between the Sacrifice of the Cross and the Sacrifice of the Mass.

I.—The Banquet-Theory.

The banquet-theory of sacrifice purports to be the outcome of the application of the "historical method" to theological speculation. "The conclusions drawn from modern investigations are to the effect that sacrifice . . . was primitively a common meal of the tribe eaten in conjunction with its Deity, and that this idea always remained a predominant one throughout the history of the rite."

I have not to deal here with the legitimacy of the application of the principle of the "historical method" to dogma in general. It is sufficient to say that the historical method must have due regard for the teaching of the Church, and must not hold itself independent of the science and art of logic. Now logic lays down certain rules for the ascertaining by induction of the common essence of the individuals of a class. The common essence must exist in all individuals, without exception, belonging to the class; and in the case of a generic essence, such as sacrifice, it must be found in all the species and individuals that fall under the genus. Hence, if in several individuals which *certainly* belong to the same class there is only one common element, constant and uniform, that element is the common essence of all the individuals of that class. And if there is one *certain* individual of a class which does *not* contain a particular element possessed by all the rest of the group, that element is *not* the essence.

It would seem that the great principle from which the application of the historical method to sacrifice proceeds is the following: that the Mosaic and Christian sacrifices are valueless as material for use in the ascertaining of the true nature of sacrifice;

" Even if a definition were educed from the body of the Mosaic sacrifices, it could not be applied as a standard to any outside that particular system; for that system had undergone so many changes that the primitive elements of sacrifice in it were greatly obscured;" and " the definition is not to be constructed from the study of the great Sacrifice (of Christ) itself, or of the Jewish and Gentile religions at epochs when sacrifice had attained its greatest splendor of ritual and its richest significance in ideas;" but that paganism alone can furnish the data for a correct solution of the problem:—" Mythology and archæology might hardly seem to be a likely field in which to search for the materials for an explanation of those transcendent mysteries, the death of the Son of God and the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. None the less is it the case that modern researches in the sand-buried ruins of Chaldæa, in the coral islands of the mid-Pacific, in classical literature and the traditions of Bedouin tribes, have furnished us with the means of better understanding the worship which has been celebrated by the Church for almost twenty centuries." The conclusion drawn from all this is that the true idea of sacrifice has been lost in the Christian Church. " If the conclusions derived from modern research in history and archæology are correct, it follows that theological writers in the past have been almost universally mistaken as to the nature of sacrificial action and the idea that it was intended to convey. A subordinate and accidental part of the ritual, which happened to be more striking to the imagination, had many deep meanings attributed to it, and was assumed to be the distinctive element of all sacrifice; while the real essential, being of a simple and unimposing character, was regarded as of small consequence. An erroneous definition of sacrifice was assumed; a false standard or test was established; on this basis various theories were built up; these would not harmonize with facts or with one another; and hence we have so many and such unconvincing explanations of the mysteries of Calvary and the Mass." This conclusion in itself suffices to render the banquet-theory suspect. If it means anything, it means that the Church of Christ, which was instituted " to restore all things in Christ," has lost the true idea of the supreme act of religion and divine worship; and this is inconceivable.

One may legitimately ask how the historical method has acquired the privilege of picking and choosing the data which it shall take into account in its investigations. It is unscientific to ignore any certain fact that has a bearing upon the point at issue; and there are no facts so certain as those which we know from divine revelation. Exponents of the historical method have claimed independence of revelation in their historical investigations, and to this independent action are due the deplorable results of the so-called Higher Criticism which has become so fashionable a cult even with many inside the Church. Dogmatic theology can never be separated from its source,—divine revelation. If it is, there must be introduced into theology the scientific method of universal doubt, akin to Descartes' Method of Universal Doubt in philosophy; and just as the Cartesian method logically led to subjectivism and scepticism in philosophy, so such a method in theology would result in theological subjectivism and scepticism and universal loss of faith. Now, the Mosaic sacrifices were instituted by divine inspiration and revelation. It is impossible therefore to set them aside as unsuitable material for our inquiry; and since their ritual was divinely prescribed in the greatest minuteness of detail, it would be hard if we could not find in them that common element which is the essence of all sacrifice. Moreover, the death of our Lord on the Cross is divinely revealed to be a true and perfect sacrifice; it therefore cannot be excluded from our survey. It must not be forgotten, too, that paganism is, in its very essence, a distortion and corruption of the true worship of the true God. We must consequently carefully discriminate between the remnants of natural religion and primitive tradition which it may have retained, and the corrupt and false beliefs, rites, and practices which are due to the loss of the true idea of the Supreme Being and to moral degeneration.

The banquet-theory, however, relies mainly on paganism for its data; and we are led to expect an interesting account of modern research in mythology, history, and archæology, "in the sand-buried ruins of Chaldæa, in the coral islands of the mid-Pacific, in classical literature, and the traditions of Bedouin tribes," but our hopes are disappointed. We hear of them no more. The only attempt to prove the thesis from the sacrifices of paganism

consists in two quotations from Döllinger's learned work on *The Gentile and the Jew*, and another from *The Veiled Majesty* by the Very Rev. W. J. Kelly. The writer of the articles says: "The conclusions drawn from modern investigations are to the effect that sacrifice never was meant for an act of destruction as such, that the notion of destruction or even of immutation never entered into it; but that it was primitively a common meal of the tribe eaten in conjunction with its Deity, and that this idea always remained the predominant one throughout the history of the rite. Dr. Döllinger deals with the sacrifices, first of the Greeks and Romans and then of the Jews, and gives exactly the same account of the two classes. Of the pagan sacrifices he writes thus: 'People joined in a sacrificial repast, the guests at which partook of the roasted flesh of the animal, and joined with it drinking of the wine consecrated by libation, thus becoming guests of the Deity at whose table they were eating, whilst the provisions in common hallowed by the god formed at the same time a close bond of union between them. It was thus these hallowed banquets formed the principal object of, and most effective bond of union in, religious associations; and hence meal-time and sacrifice were so essentially connected together that even the modes of expressing the two acts were frequently interchanged.'" I will quote the whole of the sentence, of which the above passage forms the second part. (The book lies before me as I write. The author is treating of the *Greek* sacrifices.) "*Nothing was eaten* of the burnt offerings, or of those of expiation, or of the dead, or of such as, having for object the corroboration of an oath or a contract, were charged with a curse; but, *as to the others*, people joined in a sacrificial repast," etc., as above. Nor does Döllinger say, with regard to these last, that the sacrificial repast constituted the essence of the sacrifice; they clearly followed it.

On page 9, to prove that sacrifice consists essentially in the eating of the victim, Döllinger is again referred to: "The same is the testimony of Dr. Döllinger. Speaking of heathen sacrifices, he says, 'What was consumed by fire was the portion allotted to the god from the repast.'" I am reluctantly compelled again to quote the context: "The one most essential part of the sacrifice consisted in the catching and pouring out of the blood of the

victim. The burning on the altar of certain portions of the victim previously reserved for the deity, which then followed, was no longer *properly a part of the act of sacrifice*, but *belonged to the communion which followed upon it.* As a token of atonement, and to knit closer the bond of union, men would sit at table with the deity; and what was consumed by fire was the portion allotted to the god from the repast,[3] the remainder being made over by him to the guests for their consumption."

In order to have done at once with this regrettable misuse of quotations,[4] I will deal now with the passage cited (page 9) from Drs. Wilhelm and Scannell's *Manual of Catholic Theology* on sacrifices in general: "The eating of the victim accepted by God is simply the symbol of union with God intended by those who offer the sacrifice" (Vol. II, p. 452). The context is: "The sacrificial meal is an element to be considered in the interpretation of sacrifices; but taken by itself it affords no explanation of the outpouring of blood (which is no food) and of the incense offering. *It is altogether too gross a notion to see in the ancient sacrifices nothing but a banquet in which the gods were supposed to take part.*" Then follows the sentence quoted: "The eating of the victim accepted by God is *simply* the symbol of the union with God intended by those who offer the sacrifice." Here the emphasis must manifestly be placed on the word "simply," and is a denial that the sacrificial meal belongs to the essence of sacrifice. And yet the sentence is quoted on behalf of the banquet-theory!

The extract from *The Veiled Majesty* does not help the banquet-theory. The sacrifice is assumed to be already complete before the eating. "It was the custom all over the earth for those who assisted at sacrifices to partake of *what had been offered in sacrifice.*" The eating is called "an essential part of sacrifice" in the sense of "the indispensable condition of communion," the necessary complement of the sacrifice. We shall see, however, that the eating of the victim was by no means universal.

But let us return to Dr. Döllinger and see whither the application of the historical method to sacrifice led him. He shall be

[3] See quotation above.

[4] The explanation, I have no doubt, is that these quotations were obtained at second-hand, and used without verification.

our guide in making an historical survey of our own. First in order he treats of the Greek sacrifices.[5] Premising that sacrifice was a natural instinct of man, "an inheritance which remained over to the Greeks out of that primal state antecedent to the division of nations, and from their Asiatic domicile, much as it may have been disfigured and obscured therein by the course of time," he proceeds: "According to the view of early antiquity, blood is the seat of the soul and of life, and hence especially acceptable to the deity as the highest and best of natural things, the prime and bloom of the whole animal world, and suited to be offered to him as a gift and a token of gratitude for benefits received. But again, the blood, from its close connection with human passions, was also considered the root and seat of sins, which were therefore to be expiated by it, and their guilt and stain washed away. It was a grace of the deity if he admitted the substitution of strange blood for one's own. This was the meaning of the sacrifice of beasts, which, even when consecrated as a holocaust, *without a portion being reserved for the offerer*, he used to kill with the knife; or if they were struck down with a club, it was still the custom for him to cut their throats to preserve the blood and enable him to offer it to the deity by pouring it round the altar, or wetting the altar with it. It was principally brute-animals which were used for such substitution, and such of them, too, as were nearest in relation to and intercourse with man, and at the same time had a real value in his eyes. Thus the one most essential part of the sacrifice consisted in the catching and pouring out of the blood of the victim. The burning on the altar of certain portions of the victim previously reserved for the deity, which then followed, was no longer properly a part of the act of sacrifice, but belonged to the communion which followed upon it. As a token of atonement, and to knit closer the bond of union, men would sit at table with the deity; and what was consumed by fire was the portion allotted to the god from the repast, the remainder being made over by him to the guests for their consumption" (p. 226). Thus the essential constituent of sacrifice was oblation, the offering of a life, in substitution for the life of the offerer himself. Hence even human sacrifices were not unknown to the

[5] *The Gentile and the Jew*, I, 225–234.

Greeks even at a late date (pp. 227–8). The purpose of sacrifice was not only to make atonement, but also "to acknowledge in practice the supremacy and power of the divinity, to present it with a pledge, as it were, of homage and subjection to its will, to return thanks for gifts received, or protection afforded,—this was the primitive signification of many sacrifices" (p. 229). Holocausts were not of frequent occurrence, but still were sometimes offered. "Such burnt-offerings were only made to the dead, to heroes, and deities of the nether world, *who did not share them with the living*, but claimed them all for themselves" (p. 231). This also was the case with expiatory offerings, such as Xenophon offered.[6] Even where there was a sacrificial feast, "the whole animal was consecrated to the deity, and became his own property *by the act of oblation*, and therefore man was the god's guest at the sacrificial repast" (p. 231). "Nothing was eaten of the burnt-offerings, or of those of expiation, or of the dead, or of such as, having for object the corroboration of an oath or a contract, were charged with a curse" (p. 233). "It cannot be doubted that in the period known to us the whole system of sacrifice was comprehended by the great mass of the Greek people principally as a tribute to be paid or a gift to be presented to the deity" (*ibid.*).

The Persians considered the essence of sacrifice to consist in the offering of life. "The deity, they thought, desires nothing of the beast of offering but the soul that wells in his blood" (p. 399). The ordinary Persian sacrifice was the Homa, a liquid, which, as a libation, was a sacrifice, and as a beverage had a sacramental character.[7]

Of the Egyptian sacrifices some were followed by the sacrificial meal, some not; and in the cases where the victim was eaten, the oblation was the essential sacrifice, while the repast expressed the idea of communion or participation in the sacrifice (pp. 474–6).

"The sacrificial rites of the Romans[8] coincided for the most part with the Greek, still having much that was peculiar to themselves." "There were, besides, sacrifices of consultation, the

[6] *Anabasis*, VII, 8.

[7] P. 400. *Cf.* with Table of Contents "The Homa as Sacrifice and Sacrament."

[8] See Vol. II, pp. 79–89.

principal object of which was the inspection of entrails, to inquire into the will of the gods, or get council from them; in these the surrender of the life of the animal to the deity was a secondary matter, while it was a *primary* one with the others which were therefore called 'animal'" (p. 79).[9] "The action of the sacrifice itself" was the death and oblation of the victim (pp. 82–3); and the eating of the flesh has a very prosaic explanation: "In earlier times the flesh of the victim was carried to the quæstors of the public treasury, who sold it for the advantage of the State. It sometimes happened that contagious diseases arose from the quantity of accumulated flesh of the sacrifices becoming suddenly corrupt. . . . Later on, the priests, *popæ*, and *victimarii* divided among themselves what was over of the sacrifice, the flesh-meat or cakes; if the sacrifice was offered by private individuals, these took home what remained, and made a meal upon it" (p. 83). Even the sacrificial cakes and prepared dishes were consumed by fire, not eaten (p. 84). "The banquets prepared for the gods in Rome (*lectisternia*), and to which they were formally invited, are likewise to be considered as sacrifices, *but in a wider sense of the word*" (p. 84). Human sacrifices were often practised by the Romans, which frequently took the form of living burial or drowning (pp. 85–7). When the sacrifice for the lustration of a fleet was offered, "the victims were divided, and the one half consumed by fire, the other thrown into the sea" (p. 89). The eating of the victim, therefore, was in these cases impossible.

Of the Mosaic sacrifices,[10] Döllinger says: "The animals were not slain by the priests, but by the sacrificers; the priest himself only killed his own sin-offering. He who had wrought the cause of death, himself wrought the death of the beast, his proxy. The blood of the victim was then collected in a vessel by the priests, and was either sprinkled toward the altar or the horns of the altar were anointed with it. *This was in reality the most important act of the sacrifice.* 'I have given you,' says the law, 'the blood upon the altar for your soul's expiation, because the life of the

[9] These sacrifices of divination were a superstitious accretion, and consequently are of no value in our inquiry.

[10] *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 366—372.

flesh is in the blood' (Levit. 17: 11). The natural soul (*nephesh*) of the animals, or its vehicle, the blood, typified and took the place here of the soul, the life of man. The *nephesh*, the soul of the beast, was offered by the effusion of blood for the redemption of that of man, indebted to the justice of God through sin. Accordingly, this portion of the animal was not put in the power of men, and they were bound to abstain from eating blood, because of the exclusive rite of atonement through the blood of sacrifice" (p. 368). On page 6 of the first article the following statement is made: "Holy Scripture in both Testaments, while dwelling largely on the slaying of victims, the sprinkling of blood, the burning, and presentation to God, almost invariably introduces the sacrificial meal as an important part, or even as the principal part of the sacrifice." In order to show how inaccurate this assertion is, it becomes necessary to examine the sacrificial legislation of Scripture in some detail. The institution and ritual of the Mosaic sacrifices are described minutely in Levit., Chapters 1–7. In the first Chapter, on holocausts, nothing is said about eating. In Chapter 2, what is left of the offerings of flour and baked cakes becomes the property of the priests; but it is quite clear that the sacrifice is completed by what is offered upon the altar. It is a natural presumption that the priests consumed the remainder by eating, but there is no rubrical direction to that effect. The eating is quite outside the religious ceremony. Finally, the one who has the sacrifice offered does not partake. In Chapter 3, on peace offerings, eating is mentioned only to forbid it,—v. 17: "Neither blood nor fat shall you eat at all." In Chapter 4, it is made absolutely impossible to eat the flesh of the victim of the sacrifice for sins of ignorance, for the body is ordered to be totally destroyed. In Chapter 5, if two turtle-doves are offered for sin, they are not eaten; but if flour be offered, a handful is to be burnt as the sacrifice, and "the part that is left (the priest) shall have for a gift,"—here the same remarks apply as in Chapter 2: what is left is simply a perquisite of the priest. In Chapter 6, other sin-offerings are described, and twice it is distinctly prescribed that nothing shall be eaten;—v. 23: "Every sacrifice of the priest shall be consumed with fire, neither shall any man eat thereof;" and v. 30: "The victim that is slain for sin,

the blood of which is carried into the tabernacle of the testimony to make atonement in the sanctuary, shall not be eaten, but shall be burned by fire."[11]

Other victims offered for sin were eaten by the priests (v. 25); but of this Döllinger says: "The eating of this flesh was no sacrificial meal; the sacrificer and his family had no share in it; even the relatives of the priests might not partake of it with them; the priests alone were to eat the meat burdened with sin, that so they might destroy it" (p. 369). Another sin-offering, the red heifer (Numbers 19) was not eaten, but was ordered to be entirely consumed by fire. So again in Numbers 15, there is no mention of eating, and the wine is to be poured out in libation, not drunk. Similarly in Numbers 28 and 29. The banquet-theory may well consider "that the primitive elements of sacrifice in the Mosaic system were greatly obscured," albeit that these sacrifices were directly instituted by God Himself; but when it asserts also that Holy Scripture almost invariably introduces the sacrificial meal as an important part, or even as the principal part of the sacrifice, it lays itself open to a charge of self-contradiction, as well as of inaccurate statement.

In order not to leave incomplete Döllinger's survey of the Mosaic sacrifices, I must quote what he says of the peace- or thank-offering (Lev. 7). "If no part of the burnt-offerings was eaten, and if the priests alone partook of the sin-offerings, and then only when the sacrifice was not offered at the same time for their own sins, the peace- or thank-offering, on the contrary, was essentially a communion feast. . . . Here, then, was a double

[11] This sacrifice is referred to again in Levit. 16: 27: "The calf and the buck-goat that were sacrificed for sin, and whose blood was carried into the sanctuary to accomplish the atonement, they shall carry forth without the camp, and shall burn with fire, their skins, and their flesh, and their dung;" and of this St. Paul speaks (Heb. 13: 11): "The bodies of those animals, whose blood is brought into the Holies by the high-priest for sin, are burned without the camp." The point which St. Paul wishes to make here is precisely that the flesh of these victims was not eaten. "We have an altar whereof they have no power to eat who serve the tabernacle," (v. 10), *i. e.*, who cling to the Old Law; and this was foreshadowed in the ritual of the law which forbade the eating of the victim of expiation for sin, but prescribed that it should be burnt without the camp. We have therefore the inspired testimony of the Apostle to the existence of a sacrifice of the Old Law from which eating was entirely excluded.

communion: as the whole sacrifice *had* become God's property *by being consecrated to Him in sacrifice*, what man partook of was received from His hand; they were guests at the table of Jehovah, or, as was also represented, Jehovah did not disdain to become the guest of man through the priests, the ministers of His sanctuary, who partook of the meal, whilst the guests, by participation in the same food and meal, felt themselves united in a holy communion with the priests and each other (p. 370)."[12] Even in this sacrifice Döllinger makes it clear that the sacrifice itself was distinct from, and preceded the banquet, which was the participation in what had already been offered in sacrifice; and he speaks of it as "essentially a communion feast," only because the communion was a necessary, indispensable complement of *this species* of oblation.

This concludes our historical investigation into the nature of sacrifice, pagan and Jewish; and I think that it can be legitimately claimed that the "common meal" has been thereby absolutely excluded from the concept and essence of sacrifice. It is as unhistorical to assert that "in the most primitive times the idea was that the Deity actually partook of, or went through the form of partaking of, the food offered, etc." (p. 6—*cf.* pp. 4–5), as it would be unhistorical to maintain that paganism was the primitive religion, and not a degeneration and a corruption. "It is altogether too gross a notion to see in the ancient sacrifices nothing but a banquet in which the gods were supposed to take part."[13] The example of the food placed before the god Bel is an unfortunate one. Daniel quickly proved that the belief was due to the deception of the priests, exposed the fraud and destroyed the idol (Dan. 14). Such fraudulent, corrupt, and idolatrous practices are not likely to be of much value in the investigation of the true nature of sacrifice.[14]

We have now sufficient data to reconstruct the definition of sacrifice.

1. Sacrifice is a gift to God, in acknowledgment of His

[12] This last passage is quoted in the first article, p. 5, as referring to the Jewish sacrifices in general; it refers only to the peace- or thank-offering.

[13] *Manual of Catholic Theology*, II, 452.

[14] See Döllinger, *op. cit.* On Egyptian Sacrifices, I, 475–6.

supreme dominion, and of man's absolute dependence upon Him. It is constantly spoken of as an offering. St. Paul says (Heb. 5: 1): "Every high-priest taken from among men is ordained for men in the things that appertain to God, that he may *offer up gifts and sacrifices* for sins;" and (*ibid.* 8 : 3): "Every high-priest is appointed *to offer gifts and sacrifices;* wherefore it is necessary that He also (Christ) should have something *to offer.*" It may therefore be laid down as fundamental that oblation is essential to sacrifice.

2. Sacrifice is the outward sign of the inward, spiritual sacrifice: "Sacrificium visibile invisibilis sacrificii sacramentum, *i. e.*, sacrum signum est;"[15] that is, it is the sensible, external, symbolic expression of the internal act of adoration by which man acknowledges the divine dominion over himself, and his entire dependence upon God, and devotes to God himself, his life, his whole being. Moreover, the life of man is God's by another title, viz., in satisfaction for sin, the wages of which is death. There is no more appropriate substitute for the life of man than the life of an animal over which man possesses dominion; or, if his substitute is inanimate, symbolism requires that he should offer of the things which sustain human life. Hence both in the pagan and in the Jewish religions are found bloody sacrifices of animals, unbloody sacrifices of food, wine, etc. Therefore the essence of animal sacrifices was the oblation of *life as such*, not the offering of the material flesh.

3. The oblation of life is expressed and symbolized by the pouring out of the blood of the victim by the priest. This pouring of the blood was the sacerdotal, sacrificial action, the essential act of the sacrifice. We have seen that this was Dr. Döllinger's conclusion from his examination alike of the Greek and of the Mosaic sacrifices:—"The one most essential part of the sacrifice consisted in the catching and pouring out of the blood of the victim;"[16] and "The blood of the victim was then collected in a vessel by the priests, and was either sprinkled toward the altar, or the horns of the altar were anointed with it. This was in reality the most important act of the sacrifice."[17] This pouring

[15] S. Aug., *De Civ. Dei*, l. 10, c. 5.

[16] *Op. cit.*, I, 226.

[17] *Ibid.*, II, 368.

out of the blood of the victim is most strongly insisted on in the Levitical laws of sacrifice, *e. g.*, Levit. 1:5: "The priests, the sons of Aaron, shall *offer the blood* thereof, *pouring it* round about the altar," and *passim*. A general direction to the same effect is given, Levit. 17: 5–6, Deut. 12:27. St. Paul understood the effusion of blood to be the essential act of the sacrifice: "If the blood of goats and of oxen and the ashes of an heifer being sprinkled, sanctify such as are defiled, etc." (Heb. 9: 13);—and therefore the pouring out of the blood of Christ was the essence of His Sacrifice on the Cross:—"How much more shall the Blood of Christ, who by the Holy Ghost offered Himself unspotted unto God, cleanse our conscience, etc." See also Heb. 13: 11–12. Rabbi Maimonides[18] declared the sprinkling of the blood to be "the root and principle of sacrifice."

God Himself explains why the oblation of the life was placed in the effusion of the blood. "If any man whosoever of the house of Israel and of the strangers that sojourn among them, eat blood, I will set my face against his soul, and will cut him off from among his people: *because the life of the flesh is in the blood*, and I have given it to you that you may make atonement with it upon the altar for your souls, and the blood may be for an expiation of the soul. Therefore I have said to the children of Israel: No soul of you, nor of the strangers that sojourn among you, shall eat blood."[19] See Döllinger, II, 368, *supra cit.*[20]

4. The oblation of the life of an animal by the pouring out of its blood obviously implies its destruction. In order to express the absolute dominion of God over the life of man, His creature, and God's right to that life as an atonement for sin, it was necessary for man to remove the life of his vicarious offering absolutely out of his own dominion in order to offer it to God. The gift to God implies a privation of self on the part of man, and this is an integral part of sacrifice. The killing therefore is not merely preliminary or preparatory to sacrifice. Still, it is not the *formal* act of sacrifice. The slaying is to the oblation as the body is to the soul in constituting the essence of man, and as the matter of a

[18] *De Pasch.*, c. 2, n. 6.

[19] Levit. 16: 10–14; *cf.* Deut. 12: 23, 27.

[20] Eating could not be more explicitly excluded from the essence of sacrifice.

sacrament is to its form. For the killing is of itself an indifferent, indeterminate action, and not necessarily religious and sacrificial.[21] An animal may be slain for food, for sport, etc. Determination as a religious act of divine worship must therefore be given to the killing by the *formal* act of *oblation* to God, which is exclusively reserved to the priest.[22]

In these four points we have all the essential elements of sacrifice.

5. After the completion of the essential rite of sacrifice, there frequently followed in the ancient rites the sacrificial banquet or meal, especially in the case of the peace- or thank-offering. This was the participation in the sacrifice, as "the symbol of union with God intended by those who offer the sacrifice."[23] The victim offered in sacrifice has become God's; and therefore the partaking of its flesh acquires the character of a divine banquet, in which God entertains men as guests, at His own table. This participation was not part of the essence of the sacrifice, but its natural complement; and was a figure of the future Eucharistic communion which follows upon the Sacrifice of the New Law; for, having been reconciled to God by the Blood of Christ shed for us, we are admitted to participation of the divine mysteries, and are received among the friends and guests of God. Consequently, it is of the Holy Eucharist as a Sacrament, not as a Sacrifice, that St. Paul is speaking in the passage quoted in the first article, page 7 (1 Cor. 10: 16–21).

The sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb did not differ essentially from the other bloody sacrifices of the Mosaic Law. The sacrifice itself was not "a family meal" (art. 1, pp. 6–7), but a family oblation to God, offered originally by the head of the house. The essence of the sacrifice lay in the slaying of the lamb and the sprinkling of its blood on the upper door-posts, which became for the time the family altar, prefiguring the altar of the Cross, upon which the Blood of Christ was shed for our redemption. Thus

[21] Hence the killing could be and was done by laymen, professional sacrificers.

[22] In inanimate sacrifices the killing was replaced by its equivalent in lifeless things, viz., by the destruction of the nature of the offering—*e. g.*, by burning, or at least by absolutely destroying its utility for man—*e. g.*, by outpouring; and this, being performed by the priest as a religious act, included also the formal oblation.

[23] *Manual of Catholic Theology*, II, 452.

Exod. 23 : 18 : "Thou shalt not *sacrifice the blood of My victim* upon leaven;" and *ibid.* 34 : 25 : "Thou shalt not *offer the blood* of My sacrifice upon leaven; neither shall there remain in the morning anything of the victim of the solemnity of the Phase."

In later times, the blood was sprinkled by the priests on the altar as in other bloody sacrifices (II Paralip. 30 : 15–18; 35 : 11–13); and in these passages of Paralipomenon the sacrifice and the family meal are clearly distinguished.[24] Dr. Döllinger perceived this distinction, and remarks : "By all the men in the land being obliged to repair to the temple to slay their lamb, the consciousness of a national unity, compacted through God and His temple, was strengthened, and the brotherly feeling nourished of the hundreds of thousands who all joined *in offering the same sacrifice*, and *in partaking of the same sacrament.*"[25]

It is equally incorrect to say that the sacrifice of Melchisedec "was no more than a solemn banquet of bread and wine eaten before the Lord." Holy Scripture nowhere describes the manner of this sacrifice, and it is only by a *petitio principii*,—the assumption of the truth of the banquet-theory, that the above conclusion can be drawn. There can be no doubt that Melchisedec made his oblation in the usual manner of unbloody sacrifices, *i. e.*, by withdrawing part of the bread and wine from common use, by burning, effusion, or in some way effecting a change in the substance. The subsequent eating of what remained of the oblation was the participation in the sacrifice. Clement of Alexandria (lib. 4, *Stromatum*) says : "Melchisedec, rex Salem, sacerdos Dei altissimi, qui vinum et panem *sanctificatum* dedit nutrimentum in typum Eucharistiae;" 'sanctificatum,' *i. e.*, set apart and dedicated to God by oblation.[26] Rabbi Samuel (lib. *de Adventu Mess.*, c. 19): "Melchisedec instituted a sacrifice to God in bread and wine, with which he *communicated* Abraham, the friend of God;" and Rabbi Moses : "Melchisedec received Abraham returning from war to a banquet, bread and wine according to the gentile rite having *pre-*

[24] The Hebrew word to express the sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb is always either זָבַח, zabách, or שָׁחַט, shachát, both used only of bloody sacrifice; and the victim is called זֶבַח, zébach, a sacrifice of blood.

[25] *Op. cit.*, II, 374.

[26] See Bellarmine, l. 1, *de Missa*, c. 6.

viously been solemnly offered" (quoted by Suarez, in 3 p., q. 22, a. 6; Disp. 46, § 4, n. 10).

I have reserved the strongest argument against the banquet-theory of sacrifice to the last. In reference to the death of our Saviour on the Cross, the banquet-theory argues in effect as follows: "The essential constituent of sacrifice is the common meal."

Now this "essential constituent, the common meal, was not present, and was not possible" on Calvary. Therefore the death of our Lord on the Cross "is not, as considered simply in itself and independently of the Last Supper and the Mass, literally a sacrifice;" and "of all the series of events in the Passion the only one that presents the essential characteristics of sacrifice is the Last Supper, and there also did Jesus act literally as priest." This is, to a Catholic, a startling conclusion; but given the truth of the major premise, logic strictly demands it; and one cannot but admire that courage which vigorously pursues principles to their logical conclusions.

To the above syllogism I oppose the following argumentation. It is a dogma of Catholic faith that the death of our Blessed Lord on the Cross, considered simply in itself, and independently of any other event, was, in the strictest, the truest, and the most literal sense of the word, a sacrifice. But "there was no meal or quasi-meal on Calvary." Therefore the essential constituent of true sacrifice is not the common meal.

In this syllogism I conclude to the contradictory of the main thesis of the banquet-theory. The conclusion logically follows from the premises, according to the logical rules laid down in the beginning of this article. It remains only to establish the premises. We are agreed on the minor premise, which in fact is common to the two syllogisms. I have, therefore, to make good the major, viz., that it is a dogma of Catholic faith that the death of our Lord on the Cross was, of itself and independently of all else, a true, literal, and perfect sacrifice. This will be the subject of a separate paper next month.

CHARLES J. CRONIN, D.D.

Rome, Italy.

EXPERIENCES OF A MISSIONARY BISHOP IN JAPAN.[1]

II.

THE reader must not imagine that the duties of a missionary's day in Japan have come to an end with the experiences related in my last article. There remains the important item of religious conferences to be attended to. If you can read Chinese you may have noticed, in walking through the city, the letters *Shukyo Enzetsu* (religious conference) displayed upon large sign-boards almost everywhere. These meetings take place at eight o'clock very promptly in some theatre or public hall. The idea of religion in a theatre no doubt astonishes you. Do not be disturbed. Although there are in Japan theatres of doubtful reputation, the theatre usually is a great hall, which is hired to-day for a work of charity, to-morrow for a conference on hygiene, another day for a political reunion. Why then should religion not be heard there? And again, there are not many large halls, and the missionary must take what he finds.

Naturally, the missionary feels some anxiety about the success of his appeal. But he finds, generally, that the hall is filled, or very nearly so. The galleries are decorated. The little squares, large enough for two mats forming a carpet, which represent the seats, are occupied little by little: two hundred, three, five, six hundred men are there, all reclining in a sitting posture on their heels. By their present attitude you would hardly suspect that these are the fathers, the brothers, the relatives, of the soldiers who have gained such valiant conquests over the Russians.

Here and there light volumes of blue smoke rise to the ceiling; there is a confused murmur of voices, low and quiet; very different from the noise of European assemblies. There are no signs of impatience. Suddenly the large gong sounds; the pipes return to their little cases, and then,—complete silence. Three, four orators are on the programme: first, the catechist, one or two Christians prepared to speak, and, last of all, the Father or

[1] Translated by the Rev. James Anthony Walsh, Director of the "Society for the Propagation of the Faith" in the Archdiocese of Boston.

Fathers. Four discourses, sometimes five: a great many, you say. You have no idea of Japanese patience. A born orator, the Japanese loves to speak, but he knows also how to listen, which is a rarer quality. Besides, the American proverb, "time is money," is not current in Japan, and so there is no great hurry.

The missionary does his best to interest as well as instruct his audience. A séance with cinematograph is beyond his means. There is left to him the magic-lantern, which is, however, only a pretext for making the discourses on religion attractive. The most humorous among the orators will make a pretext to explain the subjects of the pictures, and this fills out the time between the acts; for the missionary will have five long hours to teach the word of God to his assembled people, who are eager for knowledge, and who know us so little.

Despite the attention and the labor, the result is often hardly appreciable, at least according to human estimate. To effect anything it is necessary that the missionary repeat this process daily, or at least several times a week. For this more than good will is needed. The hiring of the hall will have cost two or three dollars, which makes a quite considerable drain on the purse of the missionary, when one remembers that for the diffusion of religion, for his personal support, and his journeys, he has at his disposal only about *ten dollars a month.* Indeed, the lack of funds often causes him the keenest moral suffering. The good will of my missionaries would accomplish miracles, but it is paralyzed in its effects from need of means. Many countries of the richest subsoil grow nothing better than ordinary vegetables for lack of the capital necessary to exploit them. I may say the same of the Catholic religion in Japan. It rests then with its friends, with the more fortunate among the faithful in Europe and America to make it prosper. Our lot is in the hands of those who are blessed with this world's wealth.

Do not believe, however, that these conferences which are given as often as we are able, although always too rarely, are without any result. Many a time it has happened that the missionaries have gathered the fruits of a conference given by a confrère one hundred leagues away and ten years before. Thanks be to God, grace does not always take so long to operate.

At the close of a conference, some of the audience will remain about the brazier. The religious conversation will begin in a less solemn way, more interestingly, and more fruitfully also. The missionary has just spoken solemnly, respectfully. He has been heard. Now he enters into more intimate intercourse with some of these souls. This is the consolation of a day of efforts and anxiety.

The following day resembles in its general lines the preceding, but the unforeseen will probably happen. If the missionary makes visits, he receives them also; painful often, consoling sometimes, curious too. Here is a young man with frayed clothing. He is a discharged employee, the dry fruit of modern education and civilization. You will get his measure in the first few minutes of conversation. He has been baptized. You press him with questions. He does not remember the name of the one who baptized him. You insist again. No,—he is not baptized, but he has a lively desire to study the religion. Would you kindly supply him with a few yen, which he needs to go to Tokio to make his studies? This kind of exploitation is of European origin; some alms, badly placed, have put him on the road.

As always, in a country that is not Christian, the great difficulties hinge on marriage. A young Christian man enters a pagan family as an adopted son,—always a danger. A young Christian woman has been married by her parents into a family that is quite hostile to religion, and she has not known how to gain the good graces of her mother-in-law;—look out for divorce. Bad tongues say that in the American law causes of divorce are numerous. I have nothing to say about this; but in Japan—it is the rule of the "mother-in-law." She marries and unmarries with the same facility. What can be done? How can the difficulty be met?

Happily, the missionary's home duties are not confined to dismissing the exploiters, or to settling disagreeable marriage questions; he receives consoling visits. Among the visits comforting to the heart of a missionary are those of the children. Twice a week they come punctually for catechism. They say of Japan that it is the paradise of children. There is nothing truer. Above I spoke about the all-embracing power of the mother-in-

law: I exaggerated; the true king of Japan is the child. The Japanese child is the most charming little creature imaginable. Still, in its very first infancy it cries perhaps a little too much, for the good reason that the Japanese mother does not know what it is to keep the child quiet by scolding it. Up to the age of six, eight, ten years, one sees that it has been spoiled and its training injured. Lately a Marianite professor of a commercial school at Osaka, said to me: "Imagine, since the foundation of this school, we have not had occasion to inflict a single punishment." The good religious, a long-time professor in Europe, could not understand it. I know that the Japanese students in Europe and America have not such a good reputation. They are considered arrogant and badly reared. Certainly, you would never address the reproach to the little boys and girls whom you see so properly squatted around "the Father," replying with fresh voices to his questions. These are the favorites of the missionary, and quite rightly so, for in them lies the germ of his mission's future prosperity. However good may be the adult Christian, he shakes off with difficulty the defects of his earlier education—Pagan or Buddhist—and if one wishes to have the best nucleus of future Christians, it is for the children that he must be most solicitous. Whilst in America, and in many countries of Europe, the school may be neutral, the children frequently hear the Name of God. The moral principles inculcated in them have had their foundation in Christianity, and they will be fertilized by Christian sap. In Japan there is nothing of this. Japanese education is separated entirely from religion, not through sectarianism, but from principle. This does not mean that from time to time a word of ridicule may not be launched against Christianity by some professor of patriotism, —a rather old game which sees in European Christianity what it does not like. This is, however, the exception. A complaint would cause the removal of such a professor. I know of a missionary who, having brought evidence of a similar breach of neutrality (as proclaimed by the constitution) was immediately sustained by the minister of public instruction.

It is, then, in their homes, or especially at the mission, that our missionaries can cultivate the soul of the child. The privileged children are those who can come without difficulty to the instruc-

tions of "the Father." Ten, twelve, twenty, or thirty are there, according to the size of the parish, in dresses of gay colors, in figures youthful and smiling, polite and proper. Many among them, in their application to study, in quickness of comprehension, and in their ingenious replies to unforeseen objections, could rival European children of their age. They have a special facility for retaining edifying stories, and a truly remarkable ability in telling them. The talent of the narrator is in the Japanese blood.

Some of my missionaries have thought of establishing, either at their missions or in the school annexed, a work of catechism which would permit them to give solid religious instruction to Christian children whose homes were outside in the country; to have these children near them for a year, to prepare them for their First Communion, and thus to arm them for the thousand attacks which they will have to undergo for their faith,—attacks not bloody, but made every day. This most terrible struggle being against the surrounding indifference and naturalism which, in an unreligious country like Japan, holds one as in an iron vise.

If the missionary needs to keep himself more closely than ever to his exercises of piety, so as not to allow the enthusiasm of his earlier years to wane, what shall we say of the Christian who is thrown into the midst of the pagans, who never hears a single elevating word, and can receive the consolations of religion only four or five times a year? The work of such catechetical instruction would certainly be useful and necessary.

The missionary sees this. He builds his castle in his head and in his heart. Here again the financial difficulty stands in the way of his carrying out the cherished plan of finding catechetical and elementary Christian schools.

The neutrality toward religion which I have mentioned, is met with only in the secular primary schools. In the lyceums—the high schools—teachers are not so reserved. Naturally, the master will not *ex professo* combat religion, but he will express his ideas on it very openly, and these ideas are usually hostile to every religious sentiment. Not to say more, it can be asserted that the university training is openly irreligious. (And this systematic irreligion, I regret to say, is due largely to European influence.) This does not mean that in the higher schools a pro-

fessor cannot occasionally be found imbued with religious ideas; some of them, in fact, educated by Protestants, are Christians, but very few among these admit the Divinity of our Lord, so that, religiously speaking, they rather throw the Christian camp into disorder, and are one cause of the general weakness of Christianity. In the higher studies we Catholics have only a few professors, but many of our young men are students, and you can easily understand what dangers their faith has to run. To these students the missionary will have to give arms strongly tempered. When little ones have left him, the Father will often be obliged to give his attention to their seniors. He will hear from their lips thousands of current objections against religion and will have to reply to them.

† JULES CHATRON.

Bishop of Osaka, Japan.

(To be continued.)

Analecta.

EX ACTIS SUMMI PONTIFICIS.

ELEEMOSYNA MISSARUM IN ECCLESIIS REGULARIUM TAXANDA ERIT ARBITRIO ORDINARII, IUXTA MOREM REGIONIS.

Beatissime Pater,

Fr. Vincentius Buri, Guardianus Conventus Pyrrhani, in dioecesi Tergestino-Iustinopolitana, regularis Provinciae Dalmato-Patavinae, Ordinis Minorum S. Francisci Conventualium, ad pedes Sanctitatis Vestrae provolutus, quae sequuntur exponit:

Saepe ad dictum Conventum veniunt villici afferentes, sive paupertatis sive parsimoniae causa, S. Missas cum eleemosyna tamen minori quam ea quae in dioecesi viget. Dictas Missas Religiosi huius Conventus semper recipiebant easque aliis sacerdotibus indigentibus ac libenter accipientibus celebrandas fideliter committebant. Ast anno elapso 1904, R.mus Ordinarius Tergestinus decretum edidit prohibens, ne sacerdotes Missas cum eleemosyna inferiori dioecesana statuta a dioecesanis reciperent.

Stante hoc R.mi Ordinarii decreto, Orator ad securitatem propriae conscientiae et ne dicti offerentes ab Ecclesia eorumdem

Religiosorum averterentur, humiliter proponit sequens solvendum dubium:

"Utrum dicti Religiosi possint, prout hucusque erant in usu, non obstante supradicto Decreto R.mi Ordinarii, eleemosynas pro Missis inferiores taxa dioecesana recipere, easque aliis sacerdotibus indigentibus et bene sibi notis, extra tamen dioecesim, celebrandas committere.

"Et Deus, etc."

Et Sacra Congregatio omnibus perpensis, ad propositum dubium respondendum censuit:

Dentur resolutiones in una Sancti Severini, die 16 Iulii 1689, et in una Romana, die 15 Ianuarii 1639.

Tenor vero harum resolutionum ita se habet:

Sancti Severini.—Sacerdotes quotidie se offerunt celebrare ad rationem tenuis eleemosynae dimidii Iulii pro qualibet Missa, (Episcopus) supplicat declarari, an ipse statuere possit eleemosynam manualem unius integri Iulii pro qualibet Missa, imponende poenam celebrantibus pro minori quantitate.

R. *Affirmative* quoad eleemosynam manualem.

Romana.—Eleemosynam pro qualibet Missa per Regulares celebranda in eorum Ecclesiis esse taxandam arbitrio Ordinarii iuxta morem regionis.

Atque ita rescripsit. Die 8 Maii 1905.

VINCENTIUS, *Card. Episc. Praenestin., Praefectus.*

L. † S.

C. DE LAI, *Secretarius.*

E SACRA CONGREGATIONE EPISCOPORUM ET REGULARIUM.

DE IURE COMMUNI, PROFESSI VOTORUM SIMPLICIUM SUFFRAGIA FERRE POSSUNT IN ACTIS CAPITULARIBUS ORD. VOTORUM SOLEMNIUM, EXCLUSA ADMISSIONE AD PROFESSIONEM SOLEMNEM.

Beatissime Pater,

D. Eugenius Notz, Abbas Maristellae, Prior Augiae Maioris Ordinis Cisterciensis in Austria, necnon Vicarius Generalis Congregationis Cisterciensis Helveto-Germanicae ac Visitator monialium eiusdem Cisterciensis Congregationis, ad pedes S. V. humillime provolutus petit decisionem harum quaestionum:

1. Habentne monachi Congregationis Helveto-Germanicae Ordinis Cisterciensis communis observantiae simpliciter professi suffragium: (*a*) in admissione alicuius candidati ad novitiatum; (*b*) in primo et secundo scrutinio pro novitiatu continuando; (*c*) pro admissione ad vota simplicia emittenda post unum annum novitiatus?

2. Habentne iidem monachi simpliciter professi suffragium in quibuscumque abalienationibus ex parte monasterii?

3. Habentne moniales Congregationis Helveto-Germanicae Ordinis Cisterciensis communis observantiae simpliciter professae suffragium: (*a*) in admissione alicuius candidatae ad novitiatum; (*b*) in primo et secundo scrutinio pro novitiatu continuando; (*c*) pro admissione ad vota simplicia emittenda post annum unum novitiatus?

4. Habentne eaedem moniales simpliciter professae suffragium in quibuscumque abalienationibus ex parte monasterii?

5. Habentne eaedem moniales simpliciter professae vocem activam (ita ut possint eligere non autem eligi) in electione Abbatissae in dies vitae?

Sacra Congregatio E.morum ac Rev.morum S. R. E. Cardinalium Negotiis et Consultationibus Episcoporum et Regularium praeposita, perpensis omnibus, respondendum esse censuit prout respondet: "*Affirmative* in omnibus."

Romae, die 20 Februarii 1905.

D. Card. FERRATA, *Praefectus.*

L. † S.

PHILIPPUS GIUSTINI, *Secretarius.*

E SACRA CONGREGATIONE RITUUM.

I.

CIRCA PROLATIONEM VERBORUM "FLECTAMUS GENUA" IN S. ORDINATIONE; ET CIRCA LECTIONES I. NOCTURNI IN FESTIS S. MARTHAE V. ET S. BENEDICTI JOSEPHI LABRE.

R. D. Onesimus Machez, hodiernus Magister Caeremoniarum Ecclesiae Cathedralis Atrebaten. et eiusdem dioecesis Calendarii Redactor, de licentia sui Rmi Ordinarii a Sacrorum Rituum Con-

gregatione solutionem insequentium dubiorum humillime postulavit; nimirum:

I. Utrum in Ordinatione peragenda Sabbato quatuor temporum Pentecostes, vel diebus Dominicis ex indulto Apostolico, pronuntianda sint ante singulas Orationes super Ordinatos verba Pontificalis *Flectamus genua*?

II. Ex indultis Apostolicis d. d. 22 Decembris 1881 et 27 Maii 1886 festa S. Marthae Virginis (29 Iulii) pro Galliarum Ditione et S. Benedicti Iosephi Labre Confessoris (16 Aprilis) pro dioecesi Atrebaten. ad ritum duplicem maiorem evecta sunt, nulla mentione facta de Lectionibus in primo Nocturno recitandis. Calendarista vero Atrebaten., innixus decreto Sacrae Rituum Congregationis 2 Septembris 1741 ad 3, putavit assignandas esse Lectiones de Virginibus et *Iustus si morte* de communi Sanctorum donec evulgata fuerit eiusdem Sacrae Congregationis responsio *Plurium Dioecesium* 30 Iunii 1896. Quam responsionem ita interpretatus est Orator ut assignaverit utrique festo Lectiones de Scriptura occurrente in Directoriis annorum 1903, 1904, 1905. Nunc quaeritur: Utrum post decretum 3923 *Plurium dioecesium* 30 Iunii 1896, in I Nocturno utriusque festi possint retineri Lectiones de Scriptura occurrente?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, ad relationem subscripti Secretarii, audito etiam voto Commissionis Liturgicae, re mature perpensa, rescribendum censuit:

Ad I. *Affirmative* iuxta Pontificale Romanum.

Ad II. *Affirmative* ad mentem decreti n. 3923 *Plurium dioecesium.*

Atque ita rescripsit. Die 7 Iulii 1905.

A. *Card.* TRIPEPI, *Pro-Praefectus.*

L. † S.

† D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen., Secret.*

II.

CARMELITAE A. O. OBSERVARE DEBENT RITUS PROPRIOS, QUOS PRIOR GENERALIS IN UNUM COLLIGERE POTERIT SUB TITULO RITUALIS CARMELITICI.

R. P. Simon Bernardini, Ordinis Carmelitarum Antiquae Observantiae, Sacrorum Rituum Congregationi sequentia dubia reformata, pro opportuna solutione, humillime exposuit; nimirum:

I. An ritus proprius, quo Carmelitae Antiquae Observantiae utuntur in celebratione Missae et in administratione Sacramentorum et Sacramentalium, retinendus sit ab omnibus Religiosis ad Ordinem pertinentibus, iis non exceptis, qui ad paroecias regendas assumuntur?

II. An sit improbanda praxis recepta in Liturgia Carmelitica, ut quae formae ac caeremoniae pro uno vel altero Sacramento deerunt in ritu Ordinis peculiari, ex Rituali Romano desumerentur?

Et quatenus *Affirmative* ad I, et *Negative* ad II:

III. An in facultate sit Prioris Generalis Ordinis Carmelitarum A. O. tam ritus peculiares Ordinis, quam eos, qui ex Rituali Romano supplentur, in unum volumen colligere sub titulo *Ritualis Carmeliticus* et omnibus suis subditis huius Ritualis observantiam praescribere?

Sacra porro Rituum Congregatio in peculiari Coetu ad Vaticanum habito, die 16 vertentis mensis Maii, proponente E.mo et R.mo D.no Cardinali Vincentio Vannutelli Episcopo Praenestino, et Relatore, audito etiam R. P. D. Alexandro Verde S. Fidei Promotore, omnibusque sedulo perpensis rescribendum censuit:

Ad I. *Affirmative.*

Ad II. *Negative.*

Ad III. *Affirmative.*

Quas resolutiones Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Pio Papae X, ab infrascripto Cardinali S. R. C. Pro-Praefecto relatas, Sanctitas Sua ratas habere et confirmare dignata est.

Die 24 Maii 1905.

A. *Card.* Tripepi, *Pro-Praefectus.*

L. † S.

† D. Panici, *Archiep. Laodicen., Secret.*

III.

Circa celebrationem Anniversarii Dedicationis Ecclesiae a regularibus peragendam, et circa festum Patrocinii S. Ioseph.

Hodiernus Redactor Calendarii divinorum Officiorum ad usum provinciae Austriaco-Hungaricae Societatis Iesu Sacrae Rituum Congregationi sequentia dubia pro opportuna solutione humiliter exposuit; nimirum:

I. In archidioecesi Viennensi ex privilegio S. R. C. d. 13 Ianuarii 1888 "a clero universo . . . tam saeculari quam regulari festum Dedicationis omnium ipsius archidioecesis ecclesiarum sub competente ritu quotannis Dominica III Octobris celebrari valet." Quum autem alias festa eiusmodi dioecesana Regularibus concessa intelligantur absque Octave, quaeritur: Utrum hoc idem sit observandum in casu in templis Societatis Iesu non consecratis et intra eiusdem archidioecesis limites sitis?

II. Societati Iesu concessum est festum Patrocinii S. Ioseph Dominica III post Pascha celebrandum ritu duplici I classis cum Octava, et quidem, ut Observationes ad Calendarium approbatum 6 Decembris 1888 declarant, ita fixe ea die, "etiamsi occurrat cum festo Dedicationis ecclesiae propriae, Patroni, vel Titularis ecclesiae, quae amandantur ad primam diem non impeditam." Quum autem haec sint festa primaria, quaeritur: Utrum eo ipso idem Patrocinium S. Ioseph pro Societate et a fortiori sit primarii loco habendum, nec ista praerogativa censenda revocata decreto S. R. C., n. 3808, 27 Iunii 1893, et n. 3881, 4 Februarii 1896?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, ad relationem subscripti Secretarii, exquisita sententia Commissionis Liturgicae, omnibus sedulo perpensis respondendum censuit:

Ad 1. Anniversarium Dedicationis ecclesiae etiam a Regularibus celebrandum est sub ritu duplici I classis cum Octava in ecclesiis tum consecratis quam non consecratis, iuxta decretum 3522 *Amalphitana* 20 Augusti 1880, et decretum generale 3863 *Celebrationis festorum Patroni loci, Dedicationis ac Tituli ecclesiae* 9 Iulii 1895 ad III.

Ad II. *Negative*, et concessio particularis revocata est decretis generalibus suprarelatis 3808 et 3881.

Atque ita rescripsit. Die 7 Iulii 1905.

A. *Card.* TRIPEPI, *Pro-Praefectus.*

L. ✝ S.

✝ D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen., Secretarius.*

IV.

DE CONTROVERSIA CIRCA PRAECORDIA S. FRANCISCI ASSISIENSIS.

Quaestioni olim agitatae, postea sopitae, nuperque iterum excitatae super praecordiis S. Francisci Assisiensis, quae Assisii in

Ecclesia S. Mariae ab Angelis nuncupatae, religiose custodiri alii affirmant, allata etiam vetusta Ordinis Minorum traditione; et alii negant vel in dubium revocant: Sacra Rituum Congregatio in peculiaribus Comitiis ad Vaticanum habitis die decima sexta elapsi mensis Maii, proponente E.mo et R.mo D.no Cardinali Francisco Segna Causae Relatore, omnibus ex utraque parte ad rem deductis argumentis atque documentis, discussis accurateque perpensis, attento etiam voto Commissionis Historico-Liturgicae, atque audito R. P. D. Alexandro Verde sanctae Fidei Promotore, ita respondere censuit: " Imposito partibus de hac re contendentibus et disputantibus magno silentio, quaestionis praecipuae resolutio differatur, manente interim in sua possessione enunciata traditione. Si quid autem novi pro una vel altera sententia in casu reperiatur, Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis examini et iudicio erit subiiciendum; nihilque edendum nisi de ipsius sacri Consilii expressa atque scripta licentia."

Quas resolutiones, Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Pio Papae X per infrascriptum Cardinalem Sacrae Rituum Congregationi Pro-Praefectum relatas, Sanctitas Sua ratas habuit, probavit atque servari mandavit.

Die 24 Maii 1905.

A. *Card.* Tripepi, *Pro-Praefectus.*

L. † S.

† D. Panici, *Archiep. Laodicen., Secr.*

E SACRA CONGREGATIONE INDULGENTIARUM.

I.

Indulg. conceduntur pro pio exercitio in obsequium Deiparae Immaculatae primis cuiusque mensis sabbatis.

R.mus P. Dominicus Reuter, Minister Generalis Ordinis FF. Min. Conventualium, nuper exposuit, se anno quinquagesimo mox expleto, ex quo dogma de Immaculato B.mae Virginis Conceptu proclamatum est, veterem praxim, fere oblivioni datam, revocasse, exhibendi nimirum peculiarem cultum Virgini Deiparae singulis primis cuiusque mensis sabbatis, in obsequium tam singularis privilegii intuitu meritorum Christi eidem Virgini collati; quam piam praxim f. r. Clemens XIV litteris aplicis d. d. 10 Iunii 1774 indul-

gentia biscentum dierum iam ditavit, acquirenda a christifidelibus, qui memoratis sabbatis praefati Ordinis ecclesias adivissent.

Porro quum tam laudabile exercitium, nunc denuo propositum, vehementissimo cordis affectu christifideles sint prosequuti, ne huiusmodi tepescat pietas, sed imo ferventior in posterum evadat, idem Minister Generalis humillimas preces SS.mo D.no N.ro Pio PP. X admovit, ut christifidelibus, qui singulis primis sabbatis, vel etiam dominicis, haud interruptis, infra spatium duodecim mensium sacramentali poenitentia rite expiati sacraque mensa refecti, sive precibus, sive quoque meditationibus ad honorem Virginis absque originali macula concepta aliquamdiu vacaverint, simulque ad mentem Sanctitatis Suae oraverint, plenariam indulgentiam, defunctis quoque applicabilem, memoratis sabbatis vel dominicis lucrandam, tribuere dignaretur.

Sanctitas vero Sua, votis R.mi P. Ministri Generalis obsecundare exoptans, ut erga Dei Matrem magis foveatur fidelium religio, in omnibus pro gratia iuxta preces benigne annuere dignata est. Praesenti in perpetuum valituro. Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

Datum Romae e Secretaria Sacrae Congregationis Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praepositae, die 1 Iulii 1905.

A. *Card.* TRIPEPI, *Praef.*

L. † S.

† D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen., Secret.*

II.

SANANTUR RECEPTIONES AD CONFRATERNITATEM B. M. V. DE MONTE CARMELO USQUE NUNC INVALIDE PERACTAE.

B.me Pater,

P. Praepositus Generalis Carmelitarum Discalceatorum ad Sacrorum Pedum osculum provolutus, exponit S. V. non raro contingere ut christifideles, qui ad Conf.tem B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo admitti postulant, invalide recipiantur, tum ob omissam nominum inscriptionem, tum ob aliam causam. Ne itaque praefati christifideles gratiis et privilegiis memoratae conf.ti concessis inculpatim priventur, Orator S. V. humiliter exorat, quatenus receptiones ad eamdem conf.tem quacumque ex causa usque ad hanc diem invalide peractas, benigne sanare dignetur.

Et Deus, etc.

S. C. Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praeposita, utendo facultatibus a SS. D. N. Pio Pp. X, sibi specialiter tributis, petitam sanationem benigne concessit. Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus. Datum Romae ex Sec.ria eiusdem S. C., die 28 Iunii 1905.

A. *Card.* TRIPEPI, *Praef.*

Pro Sec.rio: IOSEPHUS M. Can.cus COSELLI, *Sub.tus.*

III.

IN CASU ECCLESIAE REAEDIFICATAE FERE IN EODEM LOCO ET SUB EODEM TITULO, PRIVILEGIUM VIAE CRUCIS TRANSFERTUR SINE NOVA ERECTIONE.

Fr. Bonaventura Marrani, Ordinis FF. Minorum Procurator Generalis, ab hac S. Congregatione Indulgentiarum sequentis dubii solutionem humiliter expostulat:

Ex Decreto huius S. C. in una *Leodien.* d. d. 9 Augusti 1843 indulgentiae non cessant, si, destructa veteri Ecclesia, nova aedificetur fere in eo loco, ubi vetus existebat, et sub eodem titulo. Quaeritur:

Utrum praefata resolutio applicetur etiam Stationibus S. Viae Crucis legitime erectis, ita ut in casu Ecclesiae ex toto reaedificatae fere in eodem loco et sub eodem titulo praeexistens privilegium S. Viae Crucis non cesset, si S. Via Crucis, quae in veteri Ecclesia destructa legitime erecta extabat, salva substantia, ast sine nova erectione in Ecclesiam reaedificatam, prout dictum est, transferatur?

S. Congregatio Indulgentiis Sacrisque Reliquiis praeposita, audito Consultorum voto, proposito dubio respondendum mandavit: *Affirmative.*

Datum Romae ex Secretaria eiusdem S. C., die 7 Iunii 1905.

A. *Card.* TRIPEPI, *Praef.*

L. † S.

† DIOMEDES PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen., Secret.*

IOSEPHUS M. Can.cus COSELLI, *Subst.*

Studies and Conferences.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:—

S. Congregation (not specified) answers the question addressed to the Sovereign Pontiff: Whether the Fathers of the Franciscan Conventuals in a certain convent in the Lombard Dalmatian province are permitted to accept stipends for Masses at a lower *taxa* than that which is sanctioned by diocesan usage or the statute law. The stipend is to be fixed by the Ordinary, and the religious who make it a practice to receive a lower *taxa* to be given to poor priests for the celebration of the Mass are subject to episcopal censure.

S. Congregation of Bishops and Regulars determines the right of professed members in the Cistercian Order to vote in Chapter.

S. Congregation of Rites:—

1. (*a*) Decides that the words *Flectamus genua* are to be pronounced before each of the orations given in the Pontifical for the ordination rite.

(*b*) Determines the lessons of the first nocturn for the diocesan calendar on the feasts of St. Martha and S. Benedict Labré.

2. Approves certain rites of the Carmelite Observance in the celebration of Mass and the Sacraments, to be incorporated in a manual under the title of *Carmelite Ritual.*

3. Answers liturgical *dubia* about the anniversary celebration of the dedication of a church and of the Patronage of St. Joseph.

4. Imposes silence upon the disputants regarding the actual possession of certain relics of St. Francis of Assisi by the religious of the Church S. Maria de Angelis in Assisi.

S. Congregation of Indulgences:—

1. Attaches an indulgence to the devotion in honor of the Immaculate Conception on the first Saturday of every month.

2. Declares a *sanatio* of accidentally invalid acts of reception into the Confraternity of Mount Carmel up to June 28, 1905.

3. Decides that the *Via Crucis* privilege remains intact in a church rebuilt under the same title and in practically the same place.

BISHOP BELLORD'S THEORY OF SACRIFICE.

In the July and September numbers of the REVIEW appeared, as our readers know, two articles from the pen of the Right Reverend James Bellord, late Bishop of Milevis. The eminent author had expressed to the Editor of the REVIEW his conviction that the thesis which he had undertaken to propose and defend would arouse no inconsiderable criticism among the learned theologians throughout the Catholic world, as soon as it should come to their notice. He was eager and fully prepared to sustain his argument, and had hoped to answer the objections that might be raised against what must have appeared as a new theory to all who are familiar with the teaching of our theological text-books.

Death came to interfere with the proposed plan of the Bishop, but not until we had already printed the two articles and sent them to a number of theologians with the request that they express an opinion upon the attitude of the author toward the proposed subject. The replies came promptly; they were in the main adverse to the thesis of the Bishop. Of those who have given the reasons for their dissent from the eminent deceased theologian we have already published several answers, and our readers are familiar with the views expressed by the Rev. Fathers Lehmkuhl, S.J., T. Slater, S.J., the Rev. Dr. E. Tierney, the Very Rev. Canon Smith.

Among other reasoned objections which reached us subsequently we publish in the present issue that of the Very Rev. Canon Jules De Becker, whose opinion expresses at the same time the views of the several eminent professors of dogmatic theology in the University of Louvain; also an admirable critique by Father Sydney Smith, S.J. We cannot but feel that Father Smith strikes the golden mean in this controversy when he points out the reason for criticizing the traditional theory which, by an artificial method of reasoning, endeavors to find the note of a true

and real destruction (as an essential feature of the sacrifice) in the Mass. To our young theologians we would above all else recommend the moderation and just balancing of motives and reasons, which the article of the eminent London Jesuit illustrates, as a lesson in modern controversy which excludes all traces of *odium theologicum.*

In view of the impression Bishop Bellord's arguments may have made upon some minds unable to guard themselves against false conceptions on so important a topic, at a time when the author of these impressions has no longer any opportunity of correcting them and defending his utterance by his own lucid interpretation of it, the advisability of presenting in full the merits of the opposite side has been suggested. This side of the argument has the advantage of what might be called theological prescription, by reason of its long and universal acceptance; yet it might be elaborated here with special reference to Bishop Bellord's plea. Among the writers who offered to enter upon this more apologetic course of arguing the case was the Vice-Rector of the English College at Rome, the Rev. Dr. Charles Cronin, the first part of whose paper we now publish. The thesis is to be continued in our next issue, together with the remaining comments and arguments of the theologians engaged in the controversy.

DE NOTIONE SACRIFICII A RMO D. JACOBO BELLORD, EPISCOPO MILEVITENSI NUPER PROPOSITA.

I.

Nullatenus admittenda videtur notio sacrificii quam Rmus Auctor ponit ut fundamentum, quae notio hodiedum a multis tum in Germania, duce Wellhausen, tum in Anglia, praeeunte Robertson Smith defenditur. Quidquid enim sit de sequelis quoad mortem Christi in cruce et missae sacrificium, notio illa critice sustineri nequit. Imprimis hic adducenda non sunt vetera sacrificia Græcorum aliorumve paganorum, cum evidens sit Christum, utpote Judaeum viventem et morientem in medio Judaico, utpote insuper *complentem* vita et morte sua oeconomiam Veteris Testamenti et non aliam, Christum, inquam, si voluit offerre aliquod sacrificium, illud obtulisse juxta mentem et modum Veteris Testamenti.

Jamvero, sacrificia Veteris Testamenti, quamvis *quaedam* explicari *possent* notione Rmi Auctoris, talem explicationem nullatenus admittunt quoad omnia; dum, e contra, omnia et singula explicantur admittendo sacrificium formaliter et essentialiter consistere in oblatione Deo facta alicujus rei, qua oblatione agnoscitur dominium Dei absolutum in omnia, praesertim in vitam humanam. Juxta sententiam Auctoris non explicatur v. gr. sacrificium incensi, nec sacrificium panum propositionis quod non consistebat formaliter in eorum manducatione sed in positione coram arca foederis, nec sacrificia varia expiatoria, praesertim sacrificia pro debito et pro peccato quorum ratio formalis sita est in substitutione vicaria victimae pro homine peccatore.

Illud idem confirmatur tum ex caeremoniis quae diversis in sacrificiis locum habebant: offerentes, nempe, manum super caput victimae imponere debebant ut indicarent victimam loco ipsorum substitui; tum ex materia seu objecto sacrificii: sanguis, enim, in cujus *effusione* sacrificium saepe consistebat a Judaeis *non* adhibebatur ut *nutrimentum;* et aliunde, substantiae alimentariae in sacrificium oblatae saepius offerebantur *non paratae ad manducationem*, v. g. farina.

Quae omnia satis ostendunt sacrificia V. T. non rite explicari in sententia Auctoris, et, quidquid sit de caeteris, sacrificium saltem *expiatorium* nonnisi per ideam *substitutionis vicariae* explicatur.

II.

Nec satis sibimet ipsi cohaerere videtur Rmus Auctor. Sane, ipse admittit, quod caeteroquin Fides docet, mortem Christi esse *expiationem* pro peccatis generis humani; admittit praeterea quod, juxta Revelationem, haec mors habuerit saltem *aliquam rationem* sacrificii. Posita ergo notione sacrificii expiatorii per substitutionem vicariam, cur mors Christi non esset *strictissimo, proprio ac completo sensu* sacrificium expiatorium? Cur, insuper, Auctor qui ab una parte notionem formalem sacrificii in convivali communicatione hominis cum divinitate ponit, ideoque sacrificium proprium in ultima tantum Coena et in missa fieri asserit, ab alia parte exigit mortem in cruce ut partem sacrificii missae, quia, ut ait (p. 270) secus missa non esset sacrificium ad mentem ritualis Veteris Testamenti. An sic non habetur contradictio? Si revera in con-

vivio consistit sacrificium cur hic adstruitur juxta V. T. effusionem sanguinis requiri? Caeterum, assertum illud stare non videtur cum Revelatione. Si enim sacrificium missae *in ratione sacrificii complendum est* per mortem Christi ut per partem integrantem, non apparet quomodo sit sacrificium omnino incruentum: pars enim ejus esset cruenta—nec apparet magis quomodo sit sacrificium *verum et proprium* in quantum est *commemoratio* sacrificii crucis uti tenendum est cum Concilio Tridentino de quo statim: cum enim ratio sacrificii missae consisteret in convivio, ratio vero sacrificii crucis non in convivio, illud punctum fidei non jam salvari videtur; neque tandem percipitur quomodo stet adhuc doctrina Catholica *eandem prorsus esse victimam* oblatam in cruce et in missa, *solamque differentiam* in eo esse quod in cruce *cruento*, et in missa *non cruento* modo offeratur.

III.

Praecipua objectio sententiae Rmi Auctoris in eo est quod non salvat naturam *sacrificii proprie dicti* quae tum in Scripturis tum in traditione agnoscitur morti Christi. Quid clariori modo exprimitur in Epistola ad Haebraeos? Quid magis explicite proclamatur in Concilio Tridentino Sessione XXII capp. I et II et canone I? Pauca hic verba sufficit citare: ". . . Is igitur, Deus et Dominus noster *etsi semel seipsum in ara crucis, morte intercedente, Deo Patri oblaturus erat ut aeternam illic redemptionem operaretur*, quia tamen, etc. . . . ut debitae sponsae suae Ecclesiae *visibile . . . relinqueret sacrificium quo cruentum illud semel in cruce peragendum repraesentaretur . . .*" Et capite II: "Et quoniam in hoc divino sacrificio quod in missa peragitur idem ille Christus continetur et *incruente immolatur qui in ara crucis semel seipsum cruente obtulit . . .*"

Praeterea destruere videtur, nedum adstruat, notionem veri sacrificii in missa; ex doctrina enim Auctoris logice consequitur sacrificium eucharisticum consistere non tam in positione Christi sub specie edibili (id quod multi moderni admittunt) quam in convivali communicatione cum Deitate seu in ipso convivio. Unde sic intellectum sacrificium consisteret in sola communione et quidem adesset quoties adest convivium illud, id est quotiescumque communicant fideles: quod est inauditum in Ecclesia Catholica,

et contradicit definitioni Tridentinae Sess. XXII, canone I: "Si quis dixerit in missa non offerri Deo verum et proprium sacrificium aut *quod offerre non sit aliud quam nobis Christum ad manducandum dari, Anathema sit.*"

Ex his omnibus pronum est concludere sententiam a Rmo Auctore propositam nullatenus admitti posse.

JULES DE BECKER.

E Collegio Americano,
Lovaniensi.

Editor THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW:

I have read with interest the two articles in which the late Bishop Bellord, writing almost from his death-bed, has expounded his views on Sacrifice, and invited the criticisms of theologians. You have asked me among others for some such criticisms, and I am sending you a few, though I cannot but feel how sad it is for us to have to discuss his theory when he is no longer living to consider our criticisms in the calm and fair-minded spirit which was so noticeable in him.

Let me begin by expressing my agreement with the Bishop to this extent,—that I have never been attracted by the theories of De Lugo and Franzelin, who, starting from the position that a true and proper sacrifice must involve a true and real destruction of the victim, have endeavored to find this feature of true and real destruction in the Mass. The genius of these great theologians is conspicuous in the force with which they argue out their theory, but they do not overcome the two serious difficulties to which it is subject, that it is over-subtle and that it has not sufficient roots in the past. On the other hand I have never been much impressed by the objection urged against the older theory according to which the essence of sacrifice is sufficiently contained in the separate consecrations of the two species, as signifying the sacrificial death of our Lord by blood-shedding on Mount Calvary. It is said that a rite which does not involve but merely signifies destruction, falls short of the quality of a true and proper sacrifice, and on this point Bishop Bellord agrees with De Lugo and Franzelin. But they seem to forget, for the moment, that sacrifices, the Sacrifice of the Cross alone excepted, are

symbolic rites, and that the reality of symbols is in their power to signify. As the Bishop himself, in another connection, well says: "The sacrificial character is an *ens rationis*, a manner of representing and apprehending a certain reality,"—which reality, in the case of the Jewish and Christian sacrifices, is the slaying of the Divine Victim on Mount Calvary. It would appear then that any duly authorized external rite, which in its mode of oblation signifies by its symbols the slaying on Mount Calvary, satisfies the conditions of a true and proper sacrifice.

But to come to the Bishop's own theory. He assumes as generally acknowledged that sacrifice "belongs to a class of natural signs, and in its origin is not the creation of convention or legislation"; and (that) "it goes back to the days of the patriarchs, and is found in the most remote of heathen or natural religions." And this being so he gathers that the true way to ascertain its natural value and significance is that of the historical method. "We must trace it back through all its primitive, and even barbarous beginnings, to inquire what it consisted of and how it worked, what additions have been made to it, and how much has dropped away from it." By the application of this test he concludes that "the primary purpose of early sacrifice was to indicate and promote the communion of men with God and one another," and "that it was primitively a common meal of the tribe eaten in conjunction with its Deity, and that this idea always remained the predominant one throughout the history of the rite." The feature of destruction, according to this view, entered in later and derivatively. It was natural that men should offer the best of their food to God, and, this being animal food, it was necessary that it should be killed before it could be eaten. From this necessity, however, of a preliminary killing a further idea entered in. "The blood which was shed . . . became the source of a further symbolism, combining with and going beyond the symbolism of a common meal. Blood was identified with life and its forces; it was the abode of the soul; consanguinity was the basis of relationship, domestic, tribal, and national. . . . Blood, therefore, naturally had to fill a prominent part in the solemn ceremony, when the united community asserted its relationship together and with its God. The worshippers were

sprinkled with the blood, it was applied to the horns of the altar, and poured out in libation at its foot as the share belonging to the Deity. . . . In the Jewish system the blood of sacrifice acquired a new sanctity and significance, as being a prophetic figure of the sacred Passion and Death, of the expiation of sin, and of the higher life and union with God bestowed on mankind. . . . Sacrifice thenceforth, besides bearing the primary signification of communion with the Divinity, became the embodiment of the principle that 'without shedding of blood there is no remission.'" And so it came about that the feature of blood-shedding "eclipsed, in the eyes of later ages, the more familiar act of eating and drinking, which really is primary in the notion of sacrifice."

This is the gist of what the Bishop lays down in regard to sacrifice in general, and it is important to note in it his contention that the idea which was primitive in the rite—that of a common meal—must needs persist, and be always primary, in all the more complicated forms of sacrifice which the course of the ages developed. For it is to a large extent on the necessity of this persistency of an original element that he bases his theory that the Mass has in it the essentials of a sacrifice because it bears the character of a sacred meal. "The definition," he says, "is not to be constructed from the study either of the Great Sacrifice itself, or of the Jewish and Gentile religions at epochs when sacrifice had attained its greatest splendor of ritual and its richest significance in ideas. However we may choose ultimately to explain the supreme Sacrifice of Calvary and the Mass, it is necessary to bear in mind the latest view that the essential action of sacrifice consists in the solemn meal in common, and that its primary purpose is to bring God and men into intimate communion."

Now it is here first of all that I find myself compelled to join issue with Bishop Bellord. Granted, for the sake of argument, that the primitive idea of a sacrifice was that of a sacred banquet in which God and men ate together in fellowship, and that all else is of subsequent origin, why must that primitive conception exercise an iron sway over all future generations? It is not as if it were question of the physical growth of a literal seed; it is question of the growth of a human institution. Why then is it

impossible that some derivative element, one or more, should at a later date impress itself more on people's minds, and obtain the preference in their rites,—to the eclipsing, if it should so be, of what was primitive? Or, to put it otherwise, why cannot God, in His guidance of the race—whether through prophets like Moses, or His own Son, Jesus Christ—have ordained that in the newly-instituted sacrificial rites of a new Covenant, the predominant place should be given to a derived idea like that of oblation, or blood-shedding, or destruction generally, as being more profitable for those times,—to the subordination, if not exclusion, of the more primitive conception of a sacred meal? I can personally see no grounds for a negative answer to these questions, and it seems to me to follow that a sounder application of the historical method would send us rather to the study "of the Great Sacrifice itself and of Jewish and Gentile religions" at the commencement of the Christian era than to any modern researches among the ruins of Chaldæa, or the coral islands of the mid-Pacific, interesting and valuable as such researches may be from other points of view.

And certainly, if we interrogate the Mosaic system as it is exhibited in the Pentateuch and was carried out in the days of our Lord, or the systems of the surrounding nations as we find them exhibited in the classical literature or the allusions in the Old Testament, the primary idea in sacrifice would seem to have been not that of a sacred meal but of an *oblation.* Something is *given* to God according to some appointed ritual, which in the case of animal victims almost invariably involved slaying. Moreover, not only the fact of the oblation but its purpose was wont to be emphasized in the character of the victim or the ritual of the sacrifice; and the idea of expiation, which was so prominent among the Jews, was also prominent in the sacrifices of the Greeks and Romans. That the banquet element also entered in very largely is to be cordially acknowledged, and it is easy to see how it could enter in to complete the idea of the oblation. By the sacrificial oblation the victim or oblation was made over to the Deity whom it was desired to honor or appease, and it was the natural sequel that the worshippers should be invited to sit down at the table of the Deity and enter into the communion of friend-

ship with Him by feasting on the food that had now become His. But it is noticeable, and surely it tells strongly against the Bishop's theory, that this feasting was expressly excluded in the case of the sin-offerings among the Jews (the Paschal sacrifice being an exception, perhaps because the idea of reconciliation was so strongly imprinted on it). Even when we turn to the sacrifices of the pagans, as recent research has set them before us, it seems doubtful, to say the least, whether the Bishop's diagnosis can be accepted. Professor Tylor may be regarded as one who has a right to speak on this subject, and his conclusion as to the stages of development through which the idea of sacrifice has passed is based on the assumption that the fundamental idea all through is that of a gift from man to God. In the first stage the gift was principally one of food for the god to eat, but "the ruder conception that the Deity takes and values the offering for itself, gives place on the one hand to the idea of mere homage expressed by a gift, and on the other to the negative view that the virtue lies in the worshipper depriving himself of something prized." Indeed Professor Tylor mentions the banquet-element in pagan sacrifices only to set it down as a development marking the stage when the primitive idea of a gift offered to a god had passed into a mere formality, the god being left to satisfy himself with a small portion of the whole, whilst the remainder, in a utilitarian spirit, was reserved for a sacred banquet. In this I think he is certainly wrong, and that the idea of partaking of the table of the god was truly an integral though not the primary element of the sacrificial rite. Still, that he should propound the other view would not have been possible had the banquet-element been the universal, and the one universal, element in the vast mass of cases from which his induction had to be formed.

In his second article Bishop Bellord further claims that the banquet-theory, as applied to "the double mystery of the sacrifice on Calvary and on the altar," accords much better with the "certainties of faith" on the subject than does the destruction-theory. If it does, he has an argument on behalf of his thesis largely independent of those we have been considering. Let us then examine this new point. The "certainties of faith" he comprises in these three propositions: that the Sacrifice of the Mass

is one and the same thing with that of the Cross; that it is a true and proper sacrifice; and that it is a sacrifice according to the order of Melchisedec, not of Aaron. But, he argues, according to the destruction-theory, all the elements of sacrifice are found in the mystery of Calvary, so that no place is left for anything additional in the way of sacrifice to be supplied by the Mass, which latter becomes, therefore, superfluous; whereas, according to the banquet-theory, "the Cross and the Last Supper are two distinct parts of one and the same complex operation, each requiring the other to the completion of the whole." Again, according to the destruction-theory, the Mass cannot be a true and proper sacrifice unless it contains as its central element a true and real destruction, and yet this element is one which it is impossible to find in it without having recourse to far-fetched conceptions; whereas the banquet-theory can without difficulty find in the Mass its essential note of sacrifice, and in the mystery of Calvary that note of destruction true and real which it is quite prepared to recognize as integral though not essential to the conception of sacrifice, as it had passed into Jewish habits of thought by the time of our Lord. And lastly, the destruction-theory makes the mystery of Calvary to be a sacrifice according to the order of Aaron, contrary to the express declaration of the Epistle to the Hebrews that it was according to the order of Melchisedec —an Aaronic sacrifice being one offered through blood-shedding, and a Melchisedec sacrifice consisting in a banquet of bread and wine; whereas this incongruity is entirely avoided and an obvious harmony readily obtained, if the banquet-theory is accepted.

These are the Bishop's points, and as brought forward by him they have a claim to be carefully weighed. Nevertheless, after such careful weighing, I cannot but feel that they are open to serious and indeed obvious objections. For, in the first place, if the Mass is in itself only a banquet (which is something we *receive*), and has no element of *oblation* in it save what appertains to it as forming one whole with the mystery of Calvary (which was an oblation in the highest sense)—how are we justified in speaking of the Mass as a continual sacrifice and a *daily* offering; and how are we in conformity with the Council of Trent which, in its Sess. XXII, cap. 2, makes a clear distinction between two modes

of offering: "For there is one and the same Victim, and the same Person who *then offered* Himself on the Cross *now offers* Himself by the ministry of His priests, the sole difference being in the mode of offering?" Also, in the second place, the mystery of Calvary cannot of itself, if we accept this banquet-theory, be spoken of as a sacrifice. At best it contains those elements that contribute to the integrity of a sacrifice. And how is this consistent with the common belief of the faithful, and even with the express language and argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews? We may believe, as we do, that there is nothing in the teaching of that Epistle which excludes or fails to harmonize with the doctrine of the Mass, still we must acknowledge that it makes no allusion to the Mass, and yet it is most insistent that the mystery of Calvary was of itself alone a true and proper sacrifice. For instance, "Every priest standeth daily ministering and often offering the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins. But this Man, offering *one sacrifice* for sins, forever sitteth at the right-hand of God . . . for by one oblation He hath perfected forever them that are sanctified" (10: 11, 12, 14). And, in the third place, one cannot but note how the exigencies of his theory have led the Bishop unwittingly to misapprehend the primary sense in which the Epistle to the Hebrews distinguishes the priesthood of the order of Melchisedec from that of the order of Aaron. With the Mass before us to compare with what is read in Genesis about Melchisedec we may feel convinced that the likeness in the matter of the two sacrifices adds a further reason why our Lord's Priesthood should be estimated as of the order of Melchisedec. But the points to which the Epistle calls attention and on which it founds its argument are that, in receiving tithes from Abraham, Melchisedec prefigured a priesthood greater than that which was to spring from Abraham's loins, and that in coming forward just that once on to the page of sacred history, and, without any indication of his genealogy, he prefigured a priesthood destined to offer a sacrifice which in view of its perfection would not need to be repeated.

There are also some other points in Bishop Bellord's suggestive study on which I should like to comment were it not that I have encroached already too much on your space. What I have

noted I may in concluding summarize in a single sentence, thus: Scripture, Church tradition, and anthropology unite in testifying that, whatever be the specific definition of sacrifice, it belongs to the genus "oblation"; whereas a "sacred banquet" as such lies entirely outside this genus.

SIDNEY F. SMITH, S.J.

London, England.

WHAT FATHER LAGRANGE SAYS AND THINKS.

A Reply.

BY THE REV. THOMAS A'K. REILLY, O.P., S.T.L.

The reader of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW must follow with unusual interest the current series of learned articles on "Recent Bible Study." We do not wish to diminish this interest. We recognize that the REVIEW has taken a firm stand on one side of a question yet unsolved and which will not be solved until after the combatants of both sides have swelled their ranks to the utmost and have come together on a field of bitter strife. The Church is an intellectual body and even in the framing of definitions, which is the use of her highest prerogative, she is ruled by paramount intellectual force. For this reason, we content ourselves with correcting a few mistakes and answering a few difficulties that were set forth in the June number, confining ourselves exclusively to those which concern the erudite Fr. Lagrange.

"Biblical inerrancy" is the theme. In the first section the writer quotes and then examines critically the famous "syllogistic series" that has been widely adopted as a basis for Biblical interpretation. He devotes the second section to a short critical treatise on the application of the principles thus formulated. For the sake of clearness we shall follow the same method.

1. **General Principles.**—We have here Father Lagrange's own words: "Dieu enseigne tout ce qui est enseigné dans la Bible, mais il n'y enseigne rien que ce qui est enseigné par l'écrivain sacré, et ce dernier n'enseigne rien que ce qu'il veut y enseigner."[1] The meaning of these propositions is plain, and, if anything, the filling out of the syllogism by the writer in the REVIEW, is plainer. Now let us examine the paragraphs that follow, to learn whether the latter's views are as clear-cut as the syllogism.

[1] *Rev. Bibl.*, Oct., 1896, p. 506.

(*a*) *The Major Premise.*—"God teaches all that is taught in the Bible." Passing over the requirements for formal teaching, adopted from Fr. Nisius, we agree with the writer in stating that there are many things in the Bible that are not "taught;" but from now on we must cross swords. Let it be in an amicable spirit.

In the paragraph that follows our opponent is unfortunate. In the first place, he implicitly represents as the opinion of Fr. Lagrange that all truths in the Bible, even those that are not revealed, are expressly taught. We refer to the sentence which reads: "We fail to see why God should be said to teach these truths, if it be maintained that He did not reveal them." Secondly, he makes an inaccurate reference to the *Revue Biblique* for April; and thirdly, he inadvertently makes a false citation from the same periodical.

In order to clear the way for a consideration of these charges let us first settle the important distinction between *revealed* and *unrevealed* Biblical truths. Why not maintain that everything in Sacred Scripture is revealed? Simply because the term "revelation" seems to imply the manifestation of something previously unknown, whereas it is an established fact that several of the sacred writers were well informed beforehand, and in some cases were eye-witnesses of what they related. For this reason, Fr. Lagrange prefers to distinguish. Truths are *revealed* when they are divinely infused into the mind, or when old ideas quite forgotten are renewed (*species infusae per se vel per accidens*). But when this unusual phenomenon is unnecessary, *illumination* takes its place. This latter influence, brought to bear upon the intellect, throws more light upon acquired truths, or enables the recipient to use them to better advantage.[2] The distinction is clear; yet if one chooses to be less exact in the use of terms, he is at full liberty to be so. It suffices to keep the ideas apart. In any case, it must be understood that the intellect is not thrown back wholly on its own resources, when revelation, as above defined, ceases. The Divine influx (illumination) is there with sufficient and abundant efficacy, although not always in the same degree. "La lumière divine a des nuances infinies."[3]

Now for the difficulties. Is every truth contained in Sacred Scripture actually taught? It does not seem so, as we have already admitted; and that this is the position of Fr. Lagrange will be evident from his minor premises. For the present suffice it to say that

[2] Cf. *Rev. Bibl.*, Oct., 1896, pp. 499 and 502.

[3] *Rev. Bib.*, V, p. 504.

revelation and illumination together are coextensive with inspiration, but, just as a truth is not necessarily taught because it is inspired, neither is it taught simply because it proceeds from a mind enjoying special lights. Hence, it is incumbent upon our opponent to show where Fr. Lagrange states that truths not connected with dogmas are necessarily taught. The task will be a hard one, for the *Revue Biblique* for April leaves no doubt upon the matter. "Touching profane things, we are ready to believe in the truthfulness of Scripture, but no one can compel us to make an especial act of faith in any proposition (of the profane order), however clear it may appear, because there is nothing to prove that such a proposition is affirmed by the author and imposed upon us by him as an article of belief, and because, since such a proposition has for its object profane things, it cannot *in itself* be an object of faith" (p. 289). What is this but to say that there are certain truths, albeit profane, that are related in Holy Scripture without being "affirmed," and consequently without being taught? The opinion is emphasized by the warning that Divine affirmations (*asserta Dei*) are not to be multiplied needlessly, especially in those books that do not directly treat of the rule of faith (*ibid.*).

The second and third difficulties may be treated together. They both concern a short passage in the *Revue Biblique* of April, which we shall presently produce. After asking whether the Bible contains propositions of the purely scientific or historical order that have been revealed, Fr. Lagrange answers that, practically speaking, "la grande distinction à faire est celle des verités et des faits historiques *connexes*, comme la mort de J. C., sa Resurrection, etc., et de tout le reste, qui est inspiré, sans être revelé, et dont la connexion avec le dogme n'est que très lointaine ou même tout à fait *per accidens*" (p. 288). In a word, two classes of propositions are to be clearly distinguished: first, those that are at once revealed and historic and scientific, to which class belong the death of our Saviour, his Resurrection, etc., and secondly, all others (*tout le reste*). These latter may be either remotely connected with dogma (although in a sense *per se*), or may be entirely adventitious (*tout à fait "per accidens"*). This is far from saying either that inspired truths that are not revealed "are only *per accidens* related to dogmatic truth," or that the death of Christ and His Resurrection are of this sort. Yet this double declaration is imputed to the *Revue Biblique* by Père Lagrange's critic.

Wherefore, since inaccuracy and error, however inadvertently on his part, characterize the premise of the latter's argument, his conclu-

sion must at least be modified. "Historic and scientific subjects" *are*, in many instances, covered by divine revelation, and hence they form a part of divine teaching, a part of the grand deposit of truth confided to the Church, and which the Church has a right to interpret (*l. c.*).

In so far therefore the major premise of Fr. Lagrange is thoroughly applicable to objections brought against the said truths, truths that are by far the most important. It is also applicable to truths of the second class, but in a negative way. It tells us that we are more at liberty—in a human sense—to examine the difficulties proposed, the meaning or scientific exactness of the text, to criticize prudently and to judge with a view of obtaining a knowledge of the truth in its integrity.

(*b*) *The Minor Premise.*—"God teaches nothing (in Scripture) except what the sacred writer teaches."

We are told that the premise is "downright false." We seek proof, and it is forthcoming. "God teaches the truth conveyed in the typical sense, and the sacred writer does not necessarily intend it." Omit the "necessarily," to heighten the contrast, for the inspired writer may not even dream of the typical sense. In that case we beg leave to ask: Is the typical sense then taught *in* Scripture and *by* Scripture, or is it not rather known through tradition? Or, if God chooses to teach the typical sense in the Bible, does He not move another inspired writer to record it? Passing over the example, so familiar to us all, of the "umbra futurorum" (Col. 2: 16–17), the two wives of Abraham (Gal. 4: 24), and Adam, the type of Christ (I Cor. 15: 45), we need only insist upon the non-muzzling of "the ox that treads out the corn" (Deut. 25: 4). Who among the most superficial critics would maintain that the typical sense was taught to the Israelites in the desert? Quite the contrary. When God wished to manifest this typical meaning, He sent us a duly authorized teacher in St. Paul. It is from his pen that we have the interpretation. "Does God take care of oxen? . . . These things are written for our sakes" (I Cor. 9: 9–10). The same is true of the other examples, as a cursory reading of the texts will show.

False therefore is the charge implied in the words of the REVIEW that we are binding God by a "stricter law than that which regulates the moral life of men," that we are binding Him "with a stricter bond of truthfulness" in one case than in another. God is Truth Itself and needs not to be bound. We merely contend that we who are finite creatures with puny intelligences can know what God teaches

only by the words He uses, and that, when words fail to convey all that God wishes to impart, we must wait for another revelation at another time or in another place to complete our knowledge.

But, as a matter of fact, what is the basis of the typical sense? Is it the terms of an author, or the objects he describes? Fr. Lagrange agrees with St. Thomas in declaring that "what signifies here is not the terms, but things;" and farther on he says: "If every writer is bound to understand the terms he uses, he is not obliged to divine what the things of which he speaks represent in the future."[4]

As for the examples brought forth in defence of the contrary thesis, the first is most unhappy. "It seems most likely that God, on the one hand, inspired Caiaphas to utter the words, 'It is expedient for you that one man should die for the people,' etc. (John 11: 50), and on the other, that Caiaphas did not wish to convey the truth which God conveyed." All very true. Caiaphas was utterly unaware that he was uttering a prophecy. So were his hearers. But when God wished to teach us the full import of Caiaphas's words, He did so either through tradition—of which St. John gives us a faithful interpretation—or He revealed it directly to St. John. In either case we have God teaching nothing more or less than what the Evangelist teaches explicitly,—namely, that Caiaphas "being the high-priest of that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for the nation" (John 11: 51).

The objections that follow may be dismissed with ease. There is no difficulty about Jacob, for he was not an inspired writer. As for the prophets, we grant that they may have shared the anticipations of the Jews about the earthly pomp and majesty of the Messiah. SS. Matthew and Luke may not have been "in advance of their contemporaries." But what does that prove? Merely that a man can teach a truth without himself grasping its full significance. Nor do we have to go into the realm of inspiration for teachers of this sort. They are on all sides of us. Hence we are justified in asking: Are not we of to-day taught by the same books of Isaias, the same Gospels of SS. Matthew and Luke, as were the contemporaries of these writers? And if we understand their contents a trifle better than did those to whom they were directed, is it reasonable for us to assert that their authors did not teach what is really contained in them?

To be more scientific, it was sufficient for the inspired writer or speaker to teach what God wished him to teach. He might exclaim with Jeremias: "Ah, ah, ah, Lord God; behold, I cannot speak,

[4] *Rev. Bib.*, V, p. 506.

for I am a child,"—but one and the same answer might have been given in all cases: "Say not: I am a child; for thou shalt go to all that I shall send thee, and *whatsoever I shall command thee* thou shalt speak" (Jer. 1:7).

Father Lagrange's minor premise is not scathed in the least. If the reader wishes to interest himself in the arguments on which it rests, he will find them, as well as a full treatment of the syllogistic series, in the *Revue Biblique* for October, 1896, pp. 496 and ff.

(*c*) *The Subsumed Minor Premise:* "The sacred writer teaches only what he intends to teach."

It is to be regretted that our opponent who succeeded so well in throwing into full form the sorites of Fr. Lagrange, here fails in an informal distinction of his own. When the inspired writer speaks "ambiguously" we are told that he teaches only what he intends to say. But when he speaks in clear terms? We are not here given a negative reply; but, instead, we are told that "it would be wrong to claim that the writer did not intend to say what is actually said." This is hardly an answer to the question. "Saying" is not "teaching," and we have already shown the necessity of distinguishing between the two. Moreover, our opponent himself calls attention to this necessity in his first sentence about the "Major Premise."

What is more, the reply is a trap for its author. If the sacred writer *intends* to say all that is actually said, and if, as was never insisted upon above, the typical sense is conveyed by his words, it follows that the sacred writer *intended* and consequently knew the typical sense. Does our opponent admit this conclusion? If he does, his retort to Father Lagrange in paragraph *b* (p. 649) is inexplicable.

The distinction just given has hardly served the purpose. We are quite in accord with the responses given to both members. Yet we are inclined to ask ourselves: "Were ambiguous passages very numerous or very important in the original texts?"

Thus end all pertinent remarks on the syllogism. That they have failed to demonstrate its falsity is not surprising. That was not intended. That they have failed to show its inapplicability, its uselessness, with regard to Biblical questions generally seems certain, and this conviction is strengthened by the widespread adoption of the principles involved, by serious critics. But that they show how the doctrine of Father Lagrange seeks to do away with or to compromise Biblical inerrancy is hard to see. This last implication is too amusing

to be taken seriously. We are told that the theory of recent apologists, viz., that "the sacred writers did not intend to write science or history in the modern critical acceptance of he word, may be true in its own sweet way." If our opponent has any doubts upon the matter, he will pardon us if we propose to him the question he first taught us to use: "Were the sacred writers in advance of their contemporaries?"

The insinuation that the sacred writers should always be understood in the objective sense is not worthy of one who reads faithfully the Inspired Word. Can it be that our opponent interprets the parables of our Lord objectively? But we need not linger here. It suffices to ask: If it is legitimate to originate a parable or allegory in order to convey a moral truth, what harm is there in taking a piece of literature already in existence and giving it a religious import, especially if it is of a nature to move the mind and heart?[5] The only requirement in such a case, and the same holds good for the parable, is that the writer make no formal assertion as to the objective truth of what he says. Sound philosophy teaches this. Falsehood can be found only in judgments. Terms are true. Simple ideas are true. It is only in affirmations and negations that untruth is possible. Wherein then has Biblical inerrancy been sacrificed?

2. **Application of General Principles.**—By what has been said above the brief introduction under this heading has been reduced to an unproved assertion. In this paragraph the writer in the REVIEW asserts that the syllogistic basis of several recent methods of defending Biblical inerrancy is either inapplicable, or false, or again, true only in a certain sense; and it must be expected that the apologistic edifice reared up on such a basis is very unsafe, to say the least. We have shown above that the method of Fr. Lagrange is applicable.

(*a*) *Literary Form.* Since we are dealing exclusively with the views of Fr. Lagrange, we can afford to pass over the observations on Fr. von Hummelauer, and the fate of Lenormant's book. It is the *Methode Historique* that stands in the foreground. After reading this work, the reader "has to be prepared for seeing parts of the Old Testament reduced to legendary primitive history or occupying a place between the myth and real history," says the writer in the REVIEW, and he most emphatically condemns the system.

"It is false," says our opponent, after Fr. Billot, "that sacred writers are authors like profane authors, neither more nor less."

[5] Cf. *Rev. Bib.*, V, p. 514.

Does Fr. Lagrange maintain that they are? If he does, he must mysteriously reveal his opinion in the typical sense of what follows: "The author speaks of things which he knows naturally, but with divine help. *Everything will be made better*, for this [divine] light will exercise its influence upon the entire work of the writer, *even on the choice of words.*"[6] We italicise the final phrase since our opponent does not push inspiration beyond "individual statements." *Cf.* paragraph (*a*).

Secondly, it is false that the Biblical writers chose their own literary form, because "God is their principal Author." Without emphasizing the fact that the "instrumental" author does not forfeit his individuality under the Divine influx, and without puzzling ourselves to explain the differences of style that exist between the Synoptics in relating the same things and the uniformity there is in the style of each of them, we are satisfied to quote the following words from II Macc. 15:39: "If *I* have done well [in writing], and as it becomes the history, it is what *I desired;* but if not so perfectly, it must be pardoned *me.*"

Thirdly, "it is false that there is no literary form which the Holy Ghost cannot employ in the inspired books," whence "so-called primitive history, folk-lore, and Oriental history, must disappear." Again, we make the same retort: Did inspiration make its subjects more advanced than their contemporaries? And, granting that it did, "why bind God with a stricter bond of truthfulness when inspiring a writer" than at other times? The infinite truthfulness of God does not place Him under the necessity of transforming the nature of His agents or messenger in the plan of salvation. Hence human knowledge, sound or unsound, may, for reasons already stated, find its way into the Bible, but only in so far as it figures in its relation to the history of salvation. Nothing inclines us to believe that the light given by God effects more than what is suitable for the divine purpose.[7] "Deus non abundat in superfluis."

Hence we grant with all frankness that "if Fr. Billot is right, Fr. Lagrange [is] wrong," but we maintain with equal firmness that if Fr. Lagrange is right, then Fr. Billot is wrong.

To say a last word, Fr. Murillo's views do not appeal to us. We think that experience forces upon every practical mind the conviction that in certain stages of intellectual development, and in some cases throughout life, the individual is not capable of grasping bare historic truth, much less the moral principles therein implied. In how

[6] *Rev. Bib.*, V, p. 504 [7] *Rev. Bib.*, p. 504.

many children, for instance, is piety fostered more by the primer-stories of the Child Jesus at Nazareth, than by hearing a thousand times St. Luke's brief history of the Hidden Life? The latter appeals only to brighter and more developed minds. Now if the intellectual growth of the race is similar to that of the individual, although on a larger scale, why should we exact the same precision in the doctrine confided to the patriarchs as in that which is broadcast nowadays? And on the other hand, why should anyone be surprised that the Evangelists did not adopt the same crude methods as the author of Genesis?

To make a last quotation from Fr. Lagrange,—how easily might it happen "that the historical fact does not strike strongly enough the mind of a rude people! Then, the forms best calculated to put the fact in relief, are not metaphors created by the author, but traditional forms *sufficiently expurgated* to represent the fact correctly" (*l. c.*, 515).

Since Fr. Lagrange's name does not appear in the closing paragraphs of the paper we have been following, we feel that our task is accomplished. We have merely endeavored to show what the learned Religious says and thinks, backing up our statements with quotations taken exclusively from the periodical which he himself so skilfully manages. We have not consulted him personally upon any of the matters treated. What is more, he is a continent away, and he is not even aware that the present paper has been written. As a closing remark, we recommend his views to the serious consideration of the reader. They are, in part, "novel," but they rest upon external principles. "Novelty" alone should not frighten an intelligent mind. Else, how could such a mind appreciate the beauty there is in the evolution of Catholic dogma? Our warning therefore is, to desire, to look for, and to embrace the truth, in whatever form it may appear, and never to wed oneself so closely to any opinion as to regard all others as false. We ourselves may, it is true, be good Israelites in whom there is no guile, but we should shut up neither the mind nor the heart against our faithful brethren at Nazareth.

Jerusalem.

THE BISHOP AND THE PARISH SCHOOL.

At the convention of Catholic educators recently held in New York, Archbishop Farley made an appeal for greater unification in our educational methods, which was excellently enforced by a

practical illustration of the results which the simple observance of the Council of Baltimore produced under the leadership of the Bishop. Referring to the methodical supervision and grading of our primary and grammar schools, which had been inaugurated in nearly every diocese, the Archbishop comments with special satisfaction on the interest shown by the authorities and leaders of the parish schools who, instead of fostering local competitions among the various schools, entered into a magnificent competition of combined progress. The encouragement of the Bishops is a powerful means to preserve this onward movement toward a common end by harmonious activity on the part of teachers as communities and individuals in charge of our parish schools.

"It was good for them to have the Bishops enter into the classes of the lowest grades and examine them scrupulously; we found it was good that not only their efficiency, but likewise their deficiency, should be known to the Ordinary of the diocese. The consequence was that our schools took a turn for the better. They have risen to a level that I am constrained to say they never could have attained but for the legislative action of the Bishops of the country. To-day they stand equal to the best, the majority of them, and many of them are superior to the schools outside our own. We fear no longer any murmuring from the faithful; no longer is there found among the clergy a single one to criticize or censure our schools: not because we feel more piously inclined toward them, because conducted by religious, but for the very good reason that our schools have commanded that universal esteem."

What the organization of the Catholic Church means in the practical life of a community and what action on the part of bishop and priests can effect, is shown by the following instance which the Archbishop cites, speaking of his own diocese:

"Some three years ago, in the beginning of my administration of this diocese, I sat down one evening and wrote a number of letters—twenty or more—to a number of pastors in the city and country, where I believed Catholic schools should be and were not. I received answers from eleven of them, that at once the work would be undertaken; and last year eleven new schools were opened in this diocese. The people coöperated with the pastors immediately. I had nothing to do but to make the suggestions; those who could not conform with

my wishes gave satisfactory explanations. The following year I wrote another series of letters to pastors so situated, who had not schools—some twenty-seven—and in reply I received fifteen promises to at once enter upon the work of school building in various parishes, and this September fifteen new schools—some able to accommodate twelve or fifteen hundred children—will be opened in this diocese. There was never a murmur on the part of the people—glad, clamoring for the Catholic school. And why? Because they have attained to an excellence and elevation to which the Baltimore Council hoped to bring them and because they are the only safe places to train our children. How vast the sacrifices made for the education of our children! Yearly in this diocese fully $600,000 of their hard-earned money is paid to secure the advantages of a Catholic education for their younger children.

"Now, delegates, that work is not yet completed. Our Catholic parochial school system is not perfect yet, nor, as I said before, will it ever attain to our ideal. It is for you in your deliberations to interchange views, judgments, and experiences on the best methods of still furthering the advances made."

CASUS APOSTOLI.

Qu. It has become a practical case here in the United States, where two unbaptized persons contract marriage and after a time are divorced by the civil court, to know exactly what is the status of that marriage.

Soon after the divorce one of them remarries; the other, after a time, begins to keep company with a Catholic, with a view to marriage, goes under instruction, is received into the Church, and then applies for a dispensation, claiming the right to contract marriage with the Catholic under the Pauline Privilege. Does the person so converted to the faith enjoy the "Privilege," *regardless of the cause of the divorce* from the pagan consort?

What if they get married outside the Church, and then ask to have the question of the validity of said marriage settled by ecclesiastical authority, that they may receive the other Sacraments of the Church?

Can the newly-converted pagan claim that inasmuch as his or former consort has remarried, that he or she (as the case may be) should not be denied the "Privilege," *in favorem fidei?* In other

words, are there other reasons, besides *odium Creatoris, vel cohabitatio peccaminosa*, which give a right to the application of the Pauline Privilege?

Resp. Before answering directly the above query I wish to direct attention to a phase of the case which somewhat influences the motive, and therefore the object which underlies the appeal to the *privilegium apostoli in favorem fidei.* Moreover, this is, in the present circumstances of our mixed population in the United States, a very common, perhaps the prevailing reason for appeals to the dissolution of marriages validly contracted among non-baptized persons.

The convert, in the given case, is apparently drawn to the faith by the desire to marry a Catholic. The motive of permanent separation from the infidel husband, with whom the convert was validly married, is therefore in the first instance an attachment to the Catholic man, which attachment, however, suggests as a secondary motive the embracing of the true faith, though, as we must assume, with entire sincerity and conviction.

The question is: Does this condition or perversion of motives vitiate the appeal, when the other conditions required for the application of the Pauline Privilege are verified?

The theologian answers: No; for in such cases it may be assumed that the principle holds good: *favores ampliandi.*

The next question is whether the separation of the two parties, one of whom subsequently becomes a Catholic, indicates the existence of the other conditions to which the *privilegium Pauli* is applicable. Would the infidel refuse to receive Baptism? Would he refuse to live peaceably and without offence or danger to the faith of the convert?

The actually existing divorce, which might have had any number of causes, does not clearly indicate the answer, and an *interpellatio* would seem to be necessary in order to make the affirmative certain.

May not the affirmative be taken for granted in this case since the infidel has remarried, and thereby, as well as by the divorce itself, declared his unwillingness to live peaceably or live at all with the newly converted party? Not always. For it is possible—

(1) that the divorce was obtained for reasons which have passed away, or are altered by the very conversion of the Catholic party;

(2) that the divorced infidel repents of his pretended re-marriage;

(3) that he would in view of the altered religion of his former legitimate consort be very glad (though himself still an infidel) to become a Catholic, or at least to live with her; especially if—

(4) the cause of the divorce had been in the now converted party, and entirely against the wish and conviction of the infidel, though the latter, finding himself free by reason of a divorce forced upon him, accepted the offer of a second (really invalid) marriage.

The answer to these doubts would have to be obtained by a regular *interpellatio*.

Let us suppose that the *interpellatio* elicited some such reply as this: "I have no objection to the Catholic faith of my first wife; and if I were free I would readily return to her, since the divorce was obtained originally at her instance; indeed I have often wished I were a Catholic, and if my wife were one also I would feel sure that the opium habit, which made her fretful and dissatisfied with my company and former home circle, would be given up and then we could live happily together. Though I have remarried, my present wife and I have been thinking of getting a divorce, for we are both disappointed."

Such an answer would at once break off the engagement which had been the very cause of the divorced wife embracing the Catholic faith, namely, the hope of marrying another man who happens to be a Catholic. This she could no longer do, but would have to accept her first husband, willing to give up his false position of being the supposed husband of a second wife.

The enjoyment of the Pauline Privilege depends certainly upon the *favor fidei*, to which every other cause of divorce must be reduced.

There is still another aspect. Suppose that the two parties married as infidels in a State where the laws favored the dissolubility of marriage, one or both parties entering the contract with the understanding that in any event of incompatibility of temperament or the like reason, they might obtain a divorce and be free

to marry again. A marriage with such understanding among infidels would be invalid.

In this case no *interpellatio* would be required for a new and valid marriage, in case one of the parties were to embrace the Catholic faith.

The question, therefore, whether there are other reasons, besides "odium Creatoris vel cohabitatio peccaminosa," which give a right to the application of the Pauline Privilege, would have to be answered *negatively*, for whatever apparent reasons there may exist for a separation, they must be, *secondarily at least*, reducible to the *favor fidei*.

DEDICATION OF CHILDREN.

Qu. Occasionally I have been requested to dedicate children to the Blessed Virgin and to St. Joseph. I have not been able to find any form of dedication in the Ritual. Following the advice of an old missionary Father, I have given the blessing "Benedictio Pueri," added the last prayer in Compline, "Salve," etc., and for other dedications the prayers proper to the feast of the saint. I have never been satisfied that this was the proper form of consecration, and having inquired, and getting no further information, I ask you to kindly advise me in the REVIEW as to the proper method.

AUSTIN.

Resp. There is not, within our knowledge, any particular form of votive dedication that has a liturgical sanction, unless it be the formulas of reception into the various confraternities of the Holy Family, the Scapulars, etc., which have been indulgenced. The reason of this may be found in the fact that the Church considers the dedication of a child to the special service of our Blessed Lady, Saint Joseph, or some other saint, in the light of a private pledge made by the sponsors of the child, for which any form of invocation corresponding to individual piety may be adopted.

It is certainly commendable to have some definite form, just as we have it for initiating a youth into a temperance society, or Sodality of the Holy Name; and the "Benedictio Pueri" of the Ritual may very properly be made a principal part of the ceremony of dedicating a child to some particular saint or calling.

Criticisms and Notes.

LA THEOLOGIE DE TERTULLIEN. Par Adhémar d'Alès, Prêtre. (Bibliothèque de Théologie Historique sous la direction des professeurs de théologie à l'Institut Catholique de Paris.) Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne et Cie. 1905. Pp. 535. Price, 6 francs.

The modern zeal to establish an historical basis for Christianity which has led theological students into a critical examination of the most valued documents of Christian antiquity, has centered in a striking manner around the person and writings of Tertullian. Both Catholic and Protestant writers like Noeldecke and Hauck repeat Cyprian's celebrated dictum when appealed to for proof of certain Apostolic traditions: *Da magistrum;* and the fact that St. Jerome attests the difficulty of understanding Tertullian may have added to the eagerness with which the moderns have sought to unravel and explain his theological teaching. Protestants, like Harnack, are the more willing to accept his testimony, because St. Jerome repudiates him as "ecclesiae hominem non fuisse," although Vincent of Lerins, the great champion of tradition, pronounces the African doctor to be the *facile princeps apud Latinos,* and thus satisfies the Catholic mind as to the validity of his sources from at least the objective point of view.

The Abbé Adhémar d'Alès gives us an excellent and practical analysis of the teaching of the learned Carthagenian priest, whose pronounced tendency toward illuminism drew him at the last into the exaggerations of Montanus. That Tertullian was a Christian at heart, an ardent defender of the Church, a truthful and just historian of events, and at the same time a cultivated apologist, our author demonstrates very clearly. He also shows that Tertullian lacked the metaphysical talent which discerns and with cool deliberation decides between the promptings of an ardent zeal and the reasonable demands of a spiritual order to which less enthusiastic natures than his own must needs yield without repugnance.

It was this which robbed Tertullian for a time of the credit due to his superior gifts as an apologetic writer of the first order. No one has better succeeded in summing up, as the Abbé d'Alès shows, the proofs establishing the divine origin of Christianity and the rational

basis of Catholic belief. His demonstrations of the existence of God, of the Trinity, of man's fall, and the Redemption, of the Church's doctrine based on Scripture and tradition, and above all his fine delineation of Christian virtue as the outcome and proof of a divinely active energy in the Church, are unsurpassed in their simple cogency. The picture Tertullian draws of Christianity and the world in his own day, contrasting what is noblest in human aspirations with the lowest debasement of man's nature imaged in the pagan philosophy of life, forms a strong background for the Catholic teaching of the Sacraments and Christian worship. Here begins the evolution of Tertullian's thought and spirituality, drawing him toward Oriental conceptions of restoration with the coming of the Paraclete. The vision of the end of all things, which he foresees to be immediate, drives his vivid imagination to view the counsels of ascetical detachment in the light of rigorous duty. The natural arrogance of the teacher makes him an arbitrary legislator and an over-severe judge, and the virtue of faith is clouded in the dust of a dethroned charity.

All this our author traces in lucid and agreeable language, with ample reference to the sources, the collateral testimony of the Fathers and of Scripture. A separate appendix gives a survey of Professor Harnack's citations from the Fathers, showing their attitude toward Tertullian. There is a good index of passages, also one of Biblical references, and finally an analytical and topical index.

LETTERS ON CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. By F. M. De Zulueta, S.J. Benziger Brothers. 1905. Pp. 414.

These "Letters" were originally written for the instruction of Catholic seamen, and appeared in a little monthly published for the benefit of English mariners. They are singularly practical and supply a kind of information not often found in books of Catholic doctrine. How a Catholic is to comport himself in the company of those who are not of his faith, how far respect for their religious convictions however erroneous or an insistence upon his own is a duty in which charity and respect for God's law have equal share, are questions that puzzle many an intelligent Catholic in view of the laws of the Church and the traditions of our forefathers. Father Zulueta, or rather Father John Gretton, who began this series of instructions, wisely discriminates in such matters, and the distinctions which he makes between toleration of an erring friend and tolerance of an erroneous doctrine, or between the danger of perversion and the prejudices of people in

Catholic countries like Ireland and Italy, and the misapprehensions of non-Catholics regarding devotional practices of Catholics in England and America, is so very clear and applicable to concrete circumstances as to make this little book of Christian doctrine one of the most useful to put in the hands of any one who needs to learn on this subject.

There is an admirable chapter on "the New Testament and Divorce," and another on "the age of exemption from fasting for women" in the appendix of the volume, which is well printed with marginal references.

ROMAN EINES SEMINARISTEN. Von Dr. Mathias Hoehler, Domkapitular. Bonn: Hanstein. 1905. Pp. 496.

The *Romance of a Seminarist* is an instructive bit of pedagogical literature, the main lesson of which is to be found in this that it points out the necessity of supervision and spiritual direction for ecclesiastical students during the years of preparation for the priesthood, and incidentally affords a comparative view of the two systems of clerical education prevalent in Germany,—that of the exclusive ecclesiastical seminaries instituted according to the prescriptions of the Council of Trent, and that of theological university courses which allows the student full freedom of action during the years of study up to the first year of immediate preparation for Sacred Orders.

The venerable author writes his novel with the evident purpose of warning young students and their guardians against the dangers of the last-mentioned system, although he fully recognizes its benefits so far as they tend to develop a sense of manly independence and in a certain way test the vocation to the priestly life. But not every youth who possesses inclination and talent for the sacred calling is proof against the temptation a liberal university system puts in his way, unless he is at the same time tutored and safeguarded against the associations and enticements that corrupt the mind and the heart of the innocent and unwary. Much depends upon individual disposition and character. The palm that develops best under the silent heat of the tropical sun will not grow in the storm-swept soil where the oak develops its splendid strength.

Such is the moral of the story, in which Dr. Hoehler pictures a young student who, at the end of his college course, imbued with lofty and noble ideals, resolves to devote himself to the study of theology. "To convert the world one must know the world, mingle with, become one of it," is the maxim that presents itself as practical to his

young mind, and he resolves to act upon it. Accordingly he sets aside the advice that would direct him into the safe shelter of an ecclesiastical seminary, and seeks a Catholic university in the metropolis where he may follow the bent of his mind unfettered by rule and other restraint. He finds board in the home of a respectable family, where he meets a young lady for whom there springs up in him a gradually growing attachment, perfectly honorable, yet out of harmony with the sublime vocation to which he intends to devote his life. He sees the meshes into which he is being drawn, but lacks the courage to break away. By the advice of a disinterested friend who has silently observed the young student's difficulty, the latter accepts an offer to act, during the vacations, as temporary tutor in a French family. Here he meets a noble and devoted priest to whom he opens his heart, who places before him the grand work which awaits the clergy in our day, a work of detachment and sacrifice for the cause of Christ and the Church. Moved by the counsels of his new friends, the young man resolves to change his course. He continues his theological studies for a time in Paris, thus cutting loose from his former associations, and finally enters the *Collegio Germanico* in Rome, where he becomes a priest full of fervor and resolve for his new work of regeneration.

THE STORY OF THE HARP. By W. H. Grattan Flood, Organist of Enniscorthy Cathedral, Author of "The History of Irish Music." London: The Walter Scott Publishing Co. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.) 1905. Pp. 207.

There are many things in this volume by Mr. Grattan Flood that are likely to interest our readers. *The Harp in the Bible, the Harp of St. Kevin*, of which Giraldus tells us, the harp that was banished from the great Feis of Tara after the anathema of St. Ruadhan of Lorrha, and above all Brian Boru's famous harp, are topics around which there cling instructive memories telling of the power of God, of the noble occupation of the sacred priesthood, of the service of joy and gratitude with which the instrument is so intimately connected in the story of the past.

The main purpose of the book is of course to direct attention to the revival of harp playing, not merely as an expression of musical or patriotic sentiment, but as an aid to the perfection of modern orchestration, and even more so perhaps as a means to bring back the old folk-tunes, to which the accompaniment of the harp lends itself with

such matchless grace and at the same time not without a wholesome influence on our manners and morals; for it would mean a reaction from the overstrain and artificialness characteristic of even our popular recreations in these days. The book is a handsome as well as useful piece of literature.

PASTORAL REGEL des hl. Papstes Gregorius des Grossen. Von Dr. Benedict Sauter, O.S.B. Zum XIII Centennarium des hl. Gregor, herausgegeben von seinen Monchen. Freiburg Brisg. und St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1904. Pp. 485.

There was a time when this book of the *Pastoral Rule* was read in every monastery and cathedral school where candidates for the priesthood were being trained. The Emperor Mauritius had it translated into Greek; King Alfred himself translated it into Anglo-Saxon. In the statutes of Charlemagne's day priests were urged to have copies of it, and to hold it sacred next to the book of the Gospels. The principles of pastoral activity, the dangers and safeguards to which the great Pontiff referred in his time, have not changed save perchance in name and a certain sense of adaptation to novel circumstances. Gregory instructs a bishop, John of Ravenna, how to rule his church, how to direct his clergy; he enters upon the duties of the shepherd of souls in all their details, and draws a beautiful picture of the true pastor, the holy priest, the zealous preacher of the word of God.

That the cleric who reads German has not to complain of the want of literature in his own tongue, helpful to make him follow in the footsteps of model pastors, is shown by the translations of such works as this. In this connection we would mention Bishop Hedley's new volume, *Lex Levitarum*, which embodies the *Pastoral Rule* of St. Gregory; and to which we hope to give a separate extended notice.

Amoenitates Pastorales.

An aged clergyman with silvery hair was the recipient of several simultaneous requests from young ladies for a lock of his hair.

The requests were complied with, the clergyman being pleased to fulfil wishes which seemed founded on a sentiment of respect; and all went well until his wife received this note: "Dear Mrs. ———: Won't you please ask your husband to send me a little lock of his

hair? We have all been taking lessons in making hair flowers. So many of the other girls asked him, and he sent it to them, that I thought I would rather ask you to get it for me. Won't you please do this for me? It is so hard to get white hair for lilies of the valley."

"Father," said the small boy, "why do they call a speech made at a banquet a toast?"

"My son," was the answer, "it is probably because it is so dry."

A cleric was explaining to a farmer lad, who was studying Latin and had been called on to recite, the fact that a preposition often intensifies the meaning of a verb. "Take *cavo*, for instance," he said. "It means to hollow out. Now what will a preposition do to it?" "Intensify it, sir." "That's right. Now what would *excavo* mean?" "To holler out louder."

Maurice Barrymore relates a story of a clergyman who after he had undertaken the profession of preaching the Gospel discovered that he had dramatic talent; and accordingly he varied his clerical exercises by occasionally appearing on the stage. A famous Denver journalist, who had to give an opinion of the playing, wrote in the next morning's journal this laconic but expressive critique: "George C. Miln, the preacher-actor, played *Hamlet* at the Tabor Grand Opera House last night. He played it till twelve o'clock."

An energetic pastor who was making preparations to build a new church received all kinds of advice from parishioners, and the greatest amount came from those who had contributed the least toward the erection of the church. So at the regular services on the following Sunday he said:

"I have been receiving lots of advice during the last few weeks. I have been told by certain members of the congregation that it will not do to have too many fingers in the pie. I can assure you that I will attend to that part of it; there will be no pie."

Bishop Hamilton tells the following story and applies it: "When Bishop Fowler and I together visited the Lakes of Killarney, the driver of our jaunting-car was particular to point out to us the Devil's Mountain, the Devil's Lake, the Devil's Hole, and a great deal more of the devil's property. The bishop said at length, 'My friend, the

devil pretty generally seems to have possession here.' 'He does, your reverence,' the Irishman instantly replied; and added, 'but, like most of the landlords hereabouts, he is himself an absentee.'"

A certain venerable archdeacon engaged as a new footman a well-recommended youth who had served as stable-boy. The first duty he was called upon to perform was to accompany the archdeacon on a series of formal calls.

"Bring the cards, Thomas, and leave one at each house," ordered his master. After two hours of visiting from house to house the archdeacon's list was exhausted.

"This is the last house, Thomas," he said; "leave two cards here."

"Beggin' your pardon, sir," was the reply, "I can't—I've only the ace o' spades left."

In an amicable dispute between a theological professor and a parish priest as to the superior claims of their respective callings, an unbelieving layman was appealed to that he might give a disinterested judgment in the case.

"Oh, taking you gentlemen as a class apart," he replied good-humoredly, "there does not seem to be much difference. One set professes what it doesn't do; and the other doesn't do what it professes."

Books Received.

BIBLICAL.

CURSUS SCRIPTURAE SACRAE. Auctoribus R. Cornely, I. Knabenbauer, Fr. De Hummelauer, aliisque Soc. Iesu presbyteris. *Lexicon Biblicum.* Editore Martino Hagen, S.J. Volumen primum, A–C. Parisiis, 10 rue Cassette: P. Lethielleux. 1905. Pp. 1040.

BOOK OF DANIEL UNLOCKED. By W. S. Auchincloss, C.E., Author of *Link and Valve Motions*, etc., etc. With Introduction by A. H. Sayce, LL.D., Queen's College, Oxford, England. New York, 23 Murray St.: D. Van Nostrand Co. 1905. Pp. 134.

QUESTIONS OF THE DAY. Thoughts on the Biblical Question. By the Very Rev. Alexander MacDonald, D.D., V.G. New York: Christian Press Association. 1905. Pp. 203. Price, $0.60, *net;* by mail, $0.68.

THEOLOGICAL AND ASCETICAL.

HEALTH AND HOLINESS. A Study of the Relations between Brother Ass, the Body, and his Rider, the Soul. By Francis Thompson. With a Preface by the Rev. George Tyrrell, S.J. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1905. Pp. 80. Price, $0.55, *net.*

OXFORD CONFERENCES ON FAITH. Summer Term, 1903. By the Rev. Vincent McNabb, O.P. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder; London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd. 1905. Pp. ix—241. Price, $0.90, *net.*

THE MYSTIC TREASURES OF THE HOLY MASS. By the Rev. Charles Coppens, S.J., author of various works on Rhetoric, Philosophy, Catholic Religion, and Medical Jurisprudence. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1905. Pp. 122. Price, $0.50, *net.*

THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST. IS IT A FACT? By Gideon W. B. Marsh, B.A. (London), F. R. Hist. Soc. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder; London and Edinburgh: Sands & Co. 1905. Pp. 55. Price, $0.30, *net.*

THE APPLE OF DISCORD, or Temporal Power in the Catholic Church. By a Roman Catholic. Buffalo, N. Y.: The Apple of Discord Co. 1905. Pp. 495.

BISHOP GORE AND THE CATHOLIC CLAIMS. By Dom John Chapman, O.S.B. New York: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1905. Pp. 125. Price, $0.25.

CANTATE MARIAE. Meditations in Song. By David Bearne, S.J. London: Burns & Oates, Ltd.; New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1905. Pp. 48. Price, $0.40, *net.*

CREDO, or Stories Illustrative of the Apostles' Creed. By Mary Lape Fogg. Boston, Mass.: Angel Guardian Press. 1905. Pp. 82.

THE TEACHING OF ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI AND ITS LATEST INTERPRETERS. By Fr. Paschal Robinson, O.F.M. 1905. Pp. 26.

PRAYER. By l'Abbé Henry Bolo, Vicar General of Beauvais. Translated by Madam Cecilia, Religious of St. Andrew's Convent, Streatham. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1905. Pp. 271. Price, $1.25, *net.*

LETTERS ON CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. By F. M. De Zulueta, S.J. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1905. Pp. viii-414.

L'ANNÉE DES MALADES. Par la Comtesse de Flavigny. Deux volumes. Volume I, La Vie du Malade; Volume II, Les Lectures Spirituelles de Malade. Paris, 10 rue Cassette: P. Lethielleux. 1905. Pp., Vol. I, xvi—240; Vol. II, 219. Price, both volumes, 2 francs.

KURZGEFASSTES HANDBUCH DER KATHOLISCHEN RELIGION. Von W. Wilmers. Vierte, durchgesehene Auflage. Regensburg, Rome, New York und Cincinnati: Friedrich Pustet. 1905. Pp. vi—587. Price, $1.00, net.

LA THÉOLOGIE DE TERTULLIEN. Par Adhémar d'Alès, Prêtre. *Bibliothèque de Théologie Historique.* Publiée sous la Direction des Professeurs de Théologie à l'Institut Catholique de Paris. Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne & Cie. 1905. Pp. xvi—535.

BEITRÄGE ZUR ERKLÄRUNG DER KLAGELIEDER. Von Johann Konrad Zenner, S.J. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herdersche Verlagshandlung; Zweigniederlassungen in Wien, Strassburg, München und St. Louis, Mo. 1905. Pp. 42. Price, $0.50, *net.*